arXiv:1601.06093v1 [math.DS] 22 Jan 2016

Anti-integrable limit

Sergey Bolotin
University of Wisconsin–Madison and
Moscow Steklov Mathematical Institute

Dmitry Treschev
Moscow Steklov Mathematical Institute

Abstract

Anti-integrable limit is one of convenient and relatively simple methods for construction of chaotic hyperbolic invariant sets in Lagrangian, Hamiltonian and other dynamical systems. We discuss the most natural context of the method – discrete Lagrangian systems. Then we present examples and applications.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 The standard map **4**

3 Discrete Lagrangian systems **12**
3.1 The simplest case 12
3.2 Multivalued Lagrangians 15
3.3 DLS generated by a symplectic map 16
3.4 DLS generated by a Lagrangian flow 18

4 Anti-integrable limit in DLS **20**
4.1 Main theorem 20
4.2 Proof of Theorem 4.1 23
4.3 *G*-equivariant DLS 26

5 Examples: systems with discrete time **28**
5.1 Light particle and periodic kiks 28
5.2 Billiard in a wide strip 29
5.3 Billiard systems with small scatterers 31
5.4 Birkhoff-Smale-Shilnikov theorem 35
5.5 Shadowing a chain of invariant tori 38

6 AI limit in continuous Lagrangian systems **43**
6.1 Turaev–Shilnikov theorem for Hamiltonian systems 43
6.2 n-center problem with small masses 47
6.3 Lagrangian systems with slow time dependence 52

7 Separatrix map **57**
7.1 AI limit in Zaslavsky separatrix map 57
7.2 Separatrix map and Arnold diffusion 61

1 Introduction

Development of mathematics is inhomogeneous and unpredictable. Unexpected wonderful breakthroughs alternate with strange delays. Such a delay, difficult to explain, concerns the appearance of the general concept of anti-integrable (AI) limit. Theory of dynamical systems was technically ready for such a concept about 100 years ago partially and 50 years ago completely. The main ideas are contained in works of Poincaré, Birkhoff, Hedlund, Morse, and other creators of symbolic dynamics. Remarks on hyperbolicity of the invariant set that appears in AI limit are more or less straightforward. They need just the general concept of hyperbolicity and standard technical tools such as the cone criterium of hyperbolicity. However, anti-integrable limit as a universal approach appeared only in the end of the last century.

A starting point for the formation of the ideology of AI limit is the paper by Aubry and Abramovici [6], where the term “anti-integrable limit” was introduced and the main features of the method were fixed: the context (discrete Lagrangian systems), the main technical tool (the contraction principle) and the language for the presentation of the results (symbolic dynamics).

Recall that the standard map is the area-preserving self-map of the cylinder

$\{(x,y) : x \in \mathbb{T}, y \in \mathbb{R}\}$, $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/(2\pi\mathbb{Z})$, where

$$\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_+ \\ y_+ \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x+y+\lambda \sin x \\ y+\lambda \sin x \end{pmatrix}. \tag{1.1}$$

If compactness is needed, it is possible to take as the phase space the torus $\mathbb{T}^2$.

For $\lambda = 0$ the map is integrable: the variable y remains constant on trajectories. The case of small $|\lambda|$ was studied extensively in physical and mathematical literature. The limit $\lambda \to \infty$ is called the AI limit [6]. The main result of [6] is the construction for large $|\lambda|$ of an uncountable set of trajectories which are in one-to-one correspondence with a certain set of quasi-trajectories (codes).

AI limit appeared as a realization of the simple idea that it is natural to expect chaotic properties to become more pronounced when the "distance to the set of integrable systems", whatever this means, increases.

The absence of an analytic first integral in systems close to the AI limit is intuitively obvious. However, a formal proof of this fact needs some work.[1] On the other hand one should not think that an unbounded growth of chaos in the anti-integrable limit leads to ergodicity of the system. Indeed, the number of elliptic periodic points can be arbitrarily large for large values of λ and moreover, for an increasing sequence of the parameter, these points are asymptotically dense on the phase torus, [41]. Since in a general situation elliptic periodic trajectories are surrounded by stability islands, the standard map does not become ergodic for large $|\lambda|$. Although numerically for large values of the parameter λ the dynamics looks more and more chaotic, rigorously it is even not known if the measure of the chaotic set is positive. For example, if the metric entropy of the standard map is positive for at least one λ?

It is easy to show that trajectories constructed in AI limit form a *uniformly hyperbolic Cantor set*. Although this set is uncountable, its measure vanishes. A standard way of studying chaos quantitatively is computing (or estimating) the topological entropy which unlike the metric entropy admits relatively simple positive lower estimates. These estimates are based on the standard fact that if a system has an invariant set with dynamics conjugated to a topological Markov chain (TMC) then the topological entropy of the system is not less than that of the TMC. In the case of the standard map (1.1) this argument gives that for large λ the topological entropy is greater than $c \log \lambda$ for some positive constant c, compare with [54].

[1] In the case of two-dimensional phase space nonintegrability follows from the existence of transversal homoclinics to periodic solutions.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we give main ideas, methods and results of AI limit in the simplest nontrivial example: the standard map. We define the corresponding set of quasi-trajectories (codes) and prove that for each code there is a unique trajectory of the standard map shadowing this quasi-trajectory. The set of trajectories obtained in this way form a hyperbolic set. We show that topological entropy supported by this set is of order $\log\lambda$. In Section 3 we define the class of systems for which methods of the AI limit will be developed. These systems are called the discrete Lagrangian systems (DLS). We start from globally defined DLS (Section 3.1) and then explain how discrete Lagrangian systems can be generated by the so called ambient systems. In section 3.3 the ambient systems are symplectic maps.

Then we give examples of systems which can be studied by methods of AI limit. In each example we have a large parameter, an analog of λ in the standard map. We tried to arrange the examples in the order of increasing complexity. The first portion of examples (Section 5) contains systems with discrete time. We start with the problem on the motion of a light particle in the field of a potential with δ-like dependence on t. Then we consider a billiard system in a strip with walls, formed by graphs of periodic functions, the large parameter is the distance between the walls. After that we consider the billiard in the domain with small scatterers, where the large parameter is the inverse of the scatterers size. Then we use AI limit to prove several well known (and less well known) shadowing theorems, starting with Shilnikov description of symbolic dynamics near a transverse homoclinic orbit and ending with applications to Celestial Mechanics. In the last section we discuss application of the AI limit to the problem of Arnold diffusion.

Many examples presented in this survey are classical and go back to the dynamical folklore, so we do not always give references to the original results.

2 The standard map

Let us rewrite the map (1.1) in the "Lagrangian form". To this end suppose that

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_- \\ y_- \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_+ \\ y_+ \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then x_-, x, x_+ satisfy the equation

$$\lambda^{-1}(x_+ - 2x + x_-) = \sin x. \tag{2.1}$$

The standard map SM written in this form is defined on the cylinder $\mathscr{Z} = \mathbb{R}^2/\sim$, where the equivalence relation $\sim$ is as follows:

$$(x_1', x_2') \sim (x_1, x_2) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad x_1' - x_1 = x_2' - x_2 \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}. \tag{2.2}$$

In the other words, the cylinder $\mathscr{Z}$ is the quotient space of the plane $\mathbb{R}^2$ with respect to the action of the group of shifts

$$(x_1, x_2) \mapsto (x_1 + 2\pi l, x_2 + 2\pi l), \qquad l \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

The map SM acts as follows:

$$(x_-, x) \mapsto \mathrm{SM}(\mathrm{x}_-, \mathrm{x}) = (\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{x}_+), \quad \text{where } x_-, x, x_+ \text{ satisfy (2.1).} \tag{2.3}$$

Infinite sequences $\mathbf{x} = (x_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ such that the triple $(x_-, x, x_+) = (x_{k-1}, x_k, x_{k+1})$ satisfies (2.1) for any integer l, are called trajectories of the standard map.

The Lagrangian form of the standard map admits a variational formulation. Namely, trajectories of the system are critical points (extremals) of the formal sum

$$A(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} L(x_k, x_{k+1}), \qquad L(x', x'') = \frac{1}{2\lambda}(x' - x'')^2 - \cos x''. \tag{2.4}$$

This means that $\mathbf{x}^0 = (x_k^0)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is a trajectory if and only if for any integer n

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_n} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} L(x_k, x_{k+1}) = 0 \quad \text{at the point} \quad \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^0. \tag{2.5}$$

In the limit $\lambda \to \infty$, the standard map becomes dynamically meaningless because x_+ cannot be found in terms of x and x_- from equation (2.1) when $\lambda^{-1} = 0$. However, the corresponding variational problem remains well-defined. Its solutions are sequences

$$\mathbf{a} = (a_j)_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}, \qquad a_j \in \pi\mathbb{Z}. \tag{2.6}$$

For large values of the parameter λ the standard map has many trajectories close to sequences (2.6).

More precisely, let

$$\mathscr{A}_\Lambda = \{\mathbf{a} = (a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} : a_k \in \pi\mathbb{Z},\ |a_{k-1} - 2a_k + a_{k+1}| \le \Lambda \ \text{ for any } k \in \mathbb{Z}\ \}.$$

For any $\mathbf{a} \in \mathscr{A}_\Lambda$ we define the complete metric space $\Pi = \Pi(\mathbf{a})$ of the sequences

$$\mathbf{x} = \{x_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}, \qquad \sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} |x_k - a_k| \le \pi/2.$$

The metric on Π is defined as follows:

$$\rho(\mathbf{x}',\mathbf{x}'') = \sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} |x'_k - x''_k|, \qquad \mathbf{x}',\mathbf{x}'' \in \Pi.$$

Theorem 2.1 ([6]) *Given $\Lambda > 0$, $\sigma \in (0,\pi/2)$, and*

$$\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(\Lambda,\sigma) = \max\left\{\frac{\Lambda+4\sigma}{\sin\sigma}, \frac{8}{\cos\sigma}\right\} \tag{2.7}$$

for any $|\lambda| \geq \lambda_0$ and any $\mathbf{a} \in \mathscr{A}_\Lambda$, the standard map has a unique trajectory $\mathbf{x}$ with $\rho(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{x}) < \sigma$.

Sequences from $\mathscr{A}_\Lambda$ can be regarded as codes of the corresponding trajectories. This possibility to code trajectories by elements of a sufficiently large set is typical for chaotic systems.

Theorem 2.1 means that for large values of λ there is an invariant set $\mathscr{K}_\Lambda = \mathscr{K}_\Lambda(\lambda,\sigma) \subset \mathscr{Z}$ such that trajectories from $\mathscr{K}_\Lambda$ are in a one-to-one correspondence with elements of $\mathscr{A}_\Lambda$. Formal definition of $\mathscr{K}_\Lambda$ is as follows. Any code $\mathbf{a} \in \mathscr{A}_\Lambda$ uniquely determines an orbit $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}(\mathbf{a})$. Consider the map

$$\mathscr{A}_\Lambda \ni \mathbf{a} \mapsto \zeta(\mathbf{a}) = (x_0,x_1)/\mathbb{Z} \in \mathscr{Z},$$

where $(x_0,x_1)/\mathbb{Z}$ means identification (2.2). Then by definition $\mathscr{K}_\Lambda = \zeta(\mathscr{A}_\Lambda)$.

All trajectories in the set $\mathscr{K}_\Lambda$ are hyperbolic (Theorem 2.2). Taking another $\mathbb{Z}$-quotient, we make the phase space of SM compact: $\mathscr{Z}/\mathbb{Z}$ is diffeomorphic to the 2-torus $\mathbb{T}^2$. Then we prove that $K_\Lambda = \mathscr{K}_\Lambda/\mathbb{Z} \subset \mathbb{T}^2$ is compact (Theorem 2.3) and therefore, hyperbolic for the quotient map SM_0. Finally we estimate topological entropy of the corresponding dynamical system (Theorem 2.4).

Proof of Theorem 2.1. The proof is based on the contraction principle in the metric space $(\Pi(\mathbf{a}),\rho)$, where $\mathbf{a} \in \mathscr{A}_\Lambda$ is fixed. First we rewrite equations (2.1) in the form

$$x_k = \arcsin_k\left(\frac{x_{k+1} - 2x_k + x_{k-1}}{\lambda}\right), \tag{2.8}$$

where $\arcsin_k$ is the branch of $\sin^{-1}$ such that $\arcsin_k(0) = a_k$. Thus $\arcsin_k$ maps the interval $(-1,1)$ to the interval $\left(a_k - \frac{\pi}{2}, a_k + \frac{\pi}{2}\right)$. In other words $\arcsin_k x = a_k \pm \arcsin x$, where $\arcsin = \arcsin_0 : (-1,1) \to (-\pi/2,\pi/2)$ is the standard branch of $\sin^{-1}$ and $+$ $(-)$ is taken when a_k/π is even (odd). The sequence $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{a}$ is a trajectory of equations (2.8) for $\lambda = \infty$.

Consider the map $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{y} = \Phi(\mathbf{x})$ such that

$$y_k = \arcsin_k \Big(\frac{x_{k+1} - 2x_k + x_{k-1}}{\lambda} \Big).$$

Then any fixed point of Φ is a trajectory of SM.

Let $B_\sigma(\mathbf{a}) \subset \Pi$ be the closed ball with center $\mathbf{a}$ and radius σ.

Lemma 2.1 *Suppose that* $|\lambda| > \lambda_0$. *Then*

1. Φ *is defined on* $B = B_\sigma(\mathbf{a})$ *and* $\Phi(B) \subset B$;

2. Φ *is a contraction on* B *i.e.,*

$$\rho\big(\Phi(\mathbf{x}'), \Phi(\mathbf{x}'')\big) < \frac{1}{2}\rho(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}'') \qquad \text{for all} \quad \mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}'' \in B. \tag{2.9}$$

By contraction principle, Theorem 2.1 follows from Lemma 2.1. Now we turn to the proof of the lemma. Recall that $\sigma < \pi/2$. To check that $\Phi(B) \subset B$, it is sufficient to show that for any $\mathbf{x} \in B$

$$\Big| \frac{x_{k+1} - 2x_k + x_{k-1}}{\lambda} \Big| < \sin\sigma. \tag{2.10}$$

Since $\rho(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a}) < \sigma$, we have:

$$|x_{k+1} - 2x_k + x_{k-1}| \le \Lambda + 4\sigma.$$

Hence inequality (2.10) holds for

$$\lambda_0 > \frac{\Lambda + 4\sigma}{\sin\sigma}.$$

Note that for any pair of real numbers $u', u'' \in (-\sin\sigma, \sin\sigma)$

$$\big| \arcsin u' - \arcsin u'' \big| \le \frac{1}{\cos\sigma} |u' - u''|.$$

Here

$$\frac{1}{\cos\sigma} = \sup_{u \in (-\sin\sigma, \sin\sigma)} \Big| \frac{d}{du} \arcsin u \Big|.$$

We put $\mathbf{y}' = \Phi(\mathbf{x}')$, $\mathbf{y}'' = \Phi(\mathbf{x}'')$. Then for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |y'_k - y''_k| &= \left| \arcsin\Big(\frac{x'_{k+1} - 2x'_k + x'_{k-1}}{\lambda}\Big) - \arcsin\Big(\frac{x''_{k+1} - 2x''_k + x''_{k-1}}{\lambda}\Big) \right| \\ &\le \frac{1}{\cos\sigma} \Big| \frac{x'_{k+1} - 2x'_k + x'_{k-1}}{\lambda} - \frac{x''_{k+1} - 2x''_k + x''_{k-1}}{\lambda} \Big| \\ &\le \frac{|x'_{k+1} - x''_{k+1}| + 2|x'_k - x''_k| + |x'_{k-1} - x''_{k-1}|}{\lambda \cos\sigma} \\ &\le \frac{4}{\lambda \cos\sigma} \rho(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}''). \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

Hence inequality (2.9) holds if $\lambda_0 > 8/\cos\sigma$. Lemma 2.1 is proved. ∎

Theorem 2.2 *Given $\Lambda > 0$, $\sigma \in (0, \pi/2)$, and λ, where $|\lambda| > \lambda_0(\Lambda, \sigma)$. Then any orbit $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{a})$, $\mathbf{a} \in \mathscr{A}_\Lambda$ is hyperbolic.*

Proof. Recall that the standard definition of a hyperbolic orbit $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}(\mathbf{a})$ is given in terms of an invariant decomposition into expanding and contracting subspaces of tangent spaces at any point [52]. Here we use instead the *cone criterium* of hyperbolicity of V.M. Alexeyev, also contained in [52].

In this proof for brevity we use the notation $f = \mathrm{SM}$. By (2.1) the Jacobi matrix of the map f is as follows:

$$Df(x_-, x) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 2 + \lambda\cos x \end{pmatrix}.$$

At each point $q = (x_-, x) \in K_\Lambda$ we define the cones

$$H_q = \big\{(u_-, u) \in T_q\mathscr{Z} : \|u_-\| \le \alpha_H \|u\|\big\},\ V_q = \big\{(u_-, u) \in T_q\mathscr{Z} : \|u\| \le \alpha_V \|u_-\|\big\}, \tag{2.12}$$

where (u_-, u) are coordinates on $T_q\mathscr{Z}$ associated with the coordinates (x_-, x) on $\mathscr{Z}$.

By the cone criterium to prove hyperbolicity of trajectories in the invariant set $\mathscr{K}_\Lambda$, it is sufficient to check that there exists $\mu > 1$ such that for all $q \in \mathscr{K}_\Lambda$ the following holds:

$$Df_q H_q \subset \mathrm{Int} H_{f(q)}, \quad Df_q^{-1} V_{f(q)} \subset \mathrm{Int} V_q, \tag{2.13}$$

$$\|Df_q \xi\| \ge \mu \|\xi\| \text{ for } \xi \in H_q, \text{ and } \|Df_q^{-1}\xi\| \ge \mu\|\xi\| \text{ for } \xi \in V_{f(q)}. \tag{2.14}$$

We take $\alpha_H = \alpha_V = 1/2$. For any $q \in K_\Lambda(\lambda,\sigma)$ and $(u_-,u) \in H_q$ we have:

$$Df(q)\begin{pmatrix} u_- \\ u \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ u_+ \end{pmatrix}, \qquad u_+ = -u_- + (2+\lambda\cos x)u.$$

We see that

$$\frac{|u|}{|u_+|} \le \frac{1}{\lambda\cos\sigma - 5/2}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{pmatrix} u \\ u_+ \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{Int}\, H_{f(q)} \quad \text{provided} \quad \lambda > \frac{3}{\cos\sigma}.$$

This implies the first inclusion (2.13). We also have:

$$\left\|\begin{pmatrix} u \\ u_+ \end{pmatrix}\right\|^2 = u^2 + (\lambda\cos x - 5/2)^2 u^2 \ge 4\left\|\begin{pmatrix} u_- \\ u \end{pmatrix}\right\|^2$$

provided $\lambda > 9/(2\cos\sigma)$. Hence the first inequality (2.14) holds with $\mu = 2$.

The second inclusion (2.13) and the second inequality (2.14) can be checked analogously. It remains to note that $\lambda_0 > 9/(2\cos\sigma)$. ∎

To make chaotic properties of the map SM quantitative, we estimate its topological entropy. Since in the case of noncompact phase space topological entropy is usually infinite, we come to a quotient-system with a compact phase space. To this end we note that equations (1.1) can be considered modulo 2π. This generates the quotient system

$$\mathrm{SM}_0 : \mathbb{T}^2 \to \mathbb{T}^2, \qquad \mathbb{T}^2 = \mathbb{R}^2/(2\pi\mathbb{Z}^2)$$

such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathscr{Z} & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{SM}} & \mathscr{Z} \\ {\scriptstyle \mathrm{pr}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{pr}} \\ \mathbb{T}^2 & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{SM}_0} & \mathbb{T}^2 \end{array}, \qquad \mathrm{pr} : (x_1,x_2) \mapsto (x_1 \bmod 2\pi, x_2 \bmod 2\pi).$$

is commutative.

Consider on $\mathscr{A}_\Lambda$ and on the space $\mathscr{O}$ of orbits of SM the following action of the group $\mathbb{Z}$: for any $(l_1,l_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a} = (a_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} &\mapsto l(\mathbf{a}) = (a_i + 2\pi l_1 + 2\pi i l_2)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}, \\ \mathscr{O} \ni \mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} &\mapsto l(\mathbf{x}) = (x_i + 2\pi l_1 + 2\pi i l_2)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}. \end{aligned}$$

We define the quotient spaces

$$A_\Lambda = \mathscr{A}_\Lambda/\mathbb{Z}^2, \quad O = \mathscr{O}/\mathbb{Z}^2, \quad K_\Lambda = \mathrm{pr}\,\mathscr{K}_\Lambda.$$

Then A_Λ can be regarded as the space of codes while O as the corresponding space of orbits for SM_0. The space A_Λ can be identified with

$$B_\Lambda = \{\mathbf{b} = (b_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} : b_i \in \pi\mathbb{Z},\ |b_i| \le \Lambda\},$$

via the bijection

$$\mathbf{a} = (a_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \mapsto \mathbf{b} = (b_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}, \qquad b_i = a_{i-1} - 2a_i + a_{i+1}$$

which respects the shift operator $\mathscr{T} : (a_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \mapsto (a_{i+1})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$.

We recall the definition of the Bernoulli shift. Let J be a finite set of q symbols and $\Sigma_q = J^{\mathbb{Z}}$ the set of sequences $\mathbf{a} = (a_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ of elements of J. We equip Σ_q with the product (Tikhonov) topology: the base consists of cylinders

$$U_I(\mathbf{a}) = \{\mathbf{a}' : a'_i = a_i \ \text{ for } i \notin I\}, \quad \text{where } I \subset \mathbb{Z} \text{ is a finite set.} \tag{2.15}$$

It is well known [52] that Σ_q is a compact totally disconnected space with no isolated points and hence homeomorphic to the standard Cantor set. The Bernoulli shift with q symbols is the shift $\mathscr{T} : \Sigma_q \to \Sigma_q$.

Let

$$q = \#(\pi\mathbb{Z} \cap [-\Lambda, \Lambda]) = 1 + 2[\Lambda/\pi] \tag{2.16}$$

where $[\,]$ is the integer part of a real number.

Theorem 2.3 *For any $\lambda > \lambda_0$ the set K_Λ is a compact hyperbolic invariant set for the standard map and $\mathrm{SM}_0 : \mathrm{K}_\Lambda \to \mathrm{K}_\Lambda$ is topologically conjugate to the Bernoulli shift on the space of q symbols.*

Proof. We only need to show that $\zeta : A_\Lambda \to K_\Lambda$ is continuous. The product topology on B_Λ has the base of open sets (2.15), where $J = B_\Lambda$. In particular, for any $\mathbf{a} \in B_\Lambda$, the cylinder

$$C_n(\mathbf{a}) = \{\mathbf{a}' \in B_\Lambda : a'_i = a_i \text{ for } |i| \le n\}$$

is an open set containing $\mathbf{a}$. Continuity of ζ follows from continuity of the map $\mathbf{a} \mapsto \mathbf{x}(\mathbf{a})$ which is given by the following lemma.

Lemma 2.2 *Suppose that* $|\lambda| \geq \lambda_0$ *and* $\mathbf{a}' \in C_n(\mathbf{a})$. *Then the orbits* $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}(\mathbf{a})$ *and* $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x}(\mathbf{a}')$ *satisfy the estimates*

$$|x'_k - x_k| \leq 5^{|k|-n} \cdot 2\sigma \ \text{ for any } |k| \leq n. \tag{2.17}$$

Proof of Lemma 2.2. We obtain the sequences $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{x}'$ as the limits

$$\mathbf{x} = \lim_{j\to\infty} \mathbf{x}^{(j)}, \quad \mathbf{x}' = \lim_{j\to\infty} \mathbf{x}'^{(j)},$$
$$\mathbf{x}^{(0)} = \mathbf{a}, \quad \mathbf{x}'^{(0)} = \mathbf{a}', \quad \mathbf{x}^{(j+1)} = \Phi\mathbf{x}^{(j)}, \quad \mathbf{x}'^{(j+1)} = \Phi\mathbf{x}'^{(j)},$$

where Φ is the operator from Lemma 2.1.

We use induction in j. For $j = 0$ inequalities (2.17) hold because $x_k^{(0)} = x_k'^{(0)}$ for $|k| \leq n$. If $k = n$ then (2.17) for all $j > 0$ follows from assertion 1 of Lemma 2.1.

Suppose that (2.17) holds for some $j = s$. To prove it for $j = s+1$, we will use the estimate

$$|\mathbf{x}_k^{(j+1)} - \mathbf{x}_k'^{(j+1)}| \leq \frac{|\mathbf{x}_{k+1}^{(j)} - \mathbf{x}_{k+1}'^{(j)}| + 2|\mathbf{x}_k^{(j)} - \mathbf{x}_k'^{(j)}| + |\mathbf{x}_{k-1}^{(j)} - \mathbf{x}_{k-1}'^{(j)}|}{\lambda \cos\sigma}$$

which follows from (2.11). For any $|k| \leq n-1$ by the induction assumption we have:

$$|\mathbf{x}_k^{(s+1)} - \mathbf{x}_k'^{(s+1)}| \leq \frac{(5^{-n+|k|+1} + 2\cdot 5^{-n+|k|} + 5^{-n+|k|-1}) \cdot 2\sigma}{\lambda \cos\sigma}.$$

The right-hand side of this inequality does not exceed $5^{-n+|k|} \cdot 2\sigma$ because by (2.7) $\lambda_0 \cos\sigma \geq 8$. ∎

In [45] there is another proof of a similar estimate.

Theorem 2.4 *There exists a constant* $c > 0$ *such that for sufficiently large* λ *topological entropy of the map* SM_0 *satisfies the estimate*[2]

$$h_{top}(\mathrm{SM}_0) \geq c \log\lambda.$$

[2]Explicit estimates for c and minimal λ can be easily obtained from the proof, see also [54]. However we do not expect that these estimates are close to optimal.

Proof. We already proved that for sufficiently large λ the map SM_0 has an invariant set K_Λ such that the restriction $\mathrm{SM}_0|_{K_\Lambda}$ is conjugated to the Bernoulli shift $\mathscr{T} : \Sigma_q \to \Sigma_q$ on the space of q symbols given by (2.16). Hence $h_{top}(\mathrm{SM}_0)$ is not less than topological entropy h_q of the Bernoulli shift [52]. The quantity h_q can be computed for example, from the equation, [75] (which holds also for topological Markov chains)

$$h_q = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \theta_n, \tag{2.18}$$

where θ_n is the cardinality of all admissible n-sequences. In this case $\theta_n = q^n$. Therefore $h_q = \log q$.

It remains to note that according to (2.7) the quantity Λ can be chosen greater than a positive constant multiplied by λ. ∎

3 Discrete Lagrangian systems

Anti-integrable limit is usually discussed in Lagrangian systems. We will concentrate on the Lagrangian systems with discrete time which are called *discrete Lagrangian systems* (DLS). The case of continuous time will be reduced to the case of discrete time, Section 6.

3.1 The simplest case

Let M be an m-dimensional manifold and L a smooth[3] function on $M^2 = M \times M$. By definition a sequence $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$, $x_i \in M$, is a trajectory of the discrete Lagrangian system with the Lagrangian L if $\mathbf{x}$ is an extremal of the action functional which is the formal sum

$$A(\mathbf{x}) = \sum L(x_i, x_{i+1})$$

in the same sense as this was explained for the standard map, see (2.5). Equivalently, for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$\partial_{x_i}\big(L(x_{i-1}, x_i) + L(x_i, x_{i+1})\big) = 0. \tag{3.1}$$

Trajectories remain the same after multiplication of the Lagrangian by a constant, after addition of a constant to L and after the gauge transformation

$$L(x,y) \mapsto L(x,y) + f(x) - f(y)$$

[3] C^3 is more than enough.

with an arbitrary smooth function f on M. The gauge transformation does not change the action functional.

If the equation

$$\partial_x(L(x_-,x)+L(x,x_+))=0$$

can be globally solved for $x_- = x_-(x,x_+)$ as well as for $x_+ = x_+(x_-,x)$, then the map

$$(x_-,x)\mapsto T(x_-,x)=(x,x_+) \tag{3.2}$$

is a diffeomorphism and determines a discrete dynamical system on $M\times M$. However usually the map T is only locally defined.

To present conditions for the local existence and smoothness of the map T, we define[4]

$$B(x,y)=\partial_x\partial_y L(x,y).$$

In local coordinates,

$$B(x,y)=\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial y_j\partial x_i}\right). \tag{3.3}$$

In invariant terms, $B(x,y)$ is a linear operator $T_xM\to T_y^*M$, or a bilinear form on $T_xM\times T_yM$. We say that L is a twist Lagrangian if it satisfies the following condition.

Twist condition: $B(x,y)$ is nondegenerate for all $x,y\in M$.

In this case the map T is locally well defined and smooth. It is easy to check (see e.g. [74]) that T is symplectic with respect to the symplectic 2-form $\omega = B(x,y)\,dx\wedge dy$,

$$\omega(u,v)=\langle B(x,y)u_1,v_2\rangle-\langle B(x,y)v_1,u_2\rangle,\qquad u=(u_1,u_2),\ v=(v_1,v_2). \tag{3.4}$$

If the twist condition holds, then the Legendre transform $S: M^2\to T^*M$,

$$(x,y)\mapsto(x,p_x),\qquad p_x=-\partial_x L(x,y),$$

is locally invertible and we can represent T by a locally defined map $F=STS^{-1}$: $T^*M\to T^*M$. The map F is symplectic with respect to the standard symplectic form $dp_x\wedge dx$ on T^*M, and L is the generating function of F:

$$F(x,p_x)=(y,p_y)\quad\Leftrightarrow\quad p_x=-\partial_x L(x,y),\quad p_y=\partial_y L(x,y). \tag{3.5}$$

[4]Sometimes B is defined as $-\partial_x\partial_y L$, then in many natural DLS B will be positive definite.

Such symplectic map F is called a twist map, see [47]. Usually it is only locally defined.

The twist condition imposes strong topological restrictions on M, it is rarely satisfied on all $M \times M$. Here are two canonical examples of DLS.

1. The multidimensional standard map:

$$L(x,y) = \frac{1}{2}\big\langle B(x-y), x-y\big\rangle - \frac{1}{2}\big(V(x)+W(y)\big), \qquad x,y \in \mathbb{R}^m, \tag{3.6}$$

where B is a symmetric constant nondegenerate matrix. In this case L defines a symplectic twist map $F : \mathbb{R}^{2m} \to \mathbb{R}^{2m}$.

Usually V is assumed to be $\mathbb{Z}^m$-periodic. Then the phase space $\mathbb{R}^{2m}$ can be factorized with respect to the $\mathbb{Z}^m$-action $(x,y) \mapsto (x+k, y+k)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}^m$, and F is a symplectic twist self-map of $\mathbb{T}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m$.

We discuss such Lagrangians in more detail in section 4.3.

2. Consider a domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ bounded by a smooth convex hypersurface M. The billiard system in D is a DLS with the Lagrangian $L(x,y) = |x-y|$ on $M \times M$. Let us check that L satisfies the twist condition on $(M \times M) \setminus \Delta$, where $\Delta = \{(x,x) : x \in M\}$. Let $\langle B(x,y)v, w\rangle$ be the bilinear form on $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m$ corresponding to the operator $B(x,y) = \partial_x \partial_y L(x,y)$. A direct computation gives

$$\langle B(x,y)v, w\rangle = \frac{-\langle v,w\rangle + \langle v,e\rangle\langle w,e\rangle}{|x-y|}, \qquad e = \frac{x-y}{|x-y|}. \tag{3.7}$$

Evidently, e lies in both left and right kernel: $B(x,y)e = B^*(x,y)e = 0$. Hence, if $e \notin T_xM$ and $e \notin T_yM$, then the restriction of the bilinear form $B(x,y)$ to $T_xM \times T_yM$ is nondegenerate and hence L is a twist Lagrangian. This always holds if the boundary is strictly convex. This is well known, for a recent reference see [12].

In fact we may identify T_xM and T_yM by an isomorphism $\Pi(x,y) : T_xM \to T_yM$ which is the parallel projection in $\mathbb{R}^m$ along the segment $[x,y]$: $\Pi v = v \bmod e$. Then

$$\langle B(x,y)v, \Pi(x,y)v\rangle = \frac{-|v|^2 + \langle v,e\rangle^2}{|x-y|} < 0, \qquad v \in T_xM \setminus \{0\}.$$

We orient M as the boundary. Since $\Pi(x,y)$ changes orientation, we obtain that $(-1)^m \det B(x,y) > 0$. Note that since image and range of $B(x,y)$ are different, $\det B(x,y)$ is not invariantly defined (at least as a number), but its sign is.

If D is not convex, the billiard map T is defined on

$$\{(x,y) \in (M \times M) \setminus \Delta : \text{ the segment } (x,y) \text{ is contained in } D\},$$

and it is singular when the segment (x,y) is tangent to M.

In [74] the reader can find other examples of DLS (mostly integrable) including multivalued ones.

3.2 Multivalued Lagrangians

In applications the discrete Lagrangian L of a DLS with the configuration space M is usually multivalued. A common situation is when L is a function on the universal covering of $M \times M$. For example, for the standard map 3.6 we can assume that $M = \mathbb{T}^m$ and L is a function on $\mathbb{R}^{2m}$. One can think of such L as a multivalued function, i.e. a collection of functions on open sets in $M \times M$. To cover most possible applications we will use the following definition of a DLS.

A DLS with m degrees of freedom is defined by a finite or countable collection $\mathscr{L} = \{L_\kappa\}_{\kappa \in J}$ of functions (Lagrangians) on $U_\kappa^- \times U_\kappa^+$, where $U_\kappa^\pm$ are m-dimensional manifolds. Often $U_\kappa^\pm$ are open sets in the configuration space M. We are also given a graph with the set of vertices J and the set of edges $E \subset J^2$. The vertices $\kappa, \kappa' \in J$ are joined by an edge $\gamma = (\kappa, \kappa')$ if $W_\gamma = U_\kappa^- \cap U_{\kappa'}^+ \neq \emptyset$.

Let $\mathbf{k} = (\kappa_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$, where $\gamma_i = (\kappa_i, \kappa_{i+1}) \in E$, be a path in the graph. A trajectory of the DLS $\mathscr{L}$ corresponding to the code $\mathbf{k}$ is a sequence

$$\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, \qquad x_i \in W_{\gamma_i}, \tag{3.8}$$

which is a critical point of the formal discrete action functional

$$A_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} L_{\kappa_i}(x_i, x_{i+1}), \qquad \mathbf{k} = (\kappa_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}. \tag{3.9}$$

More precisely,

$$\partial_{x_i}(L_{\kappa_{i-1}}(x_{i-1}, x_i) + L_{\kappa_i}(x_i, x_{i+1})) = 0, \qquad i \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{3.10}$$

Thus a trajectory is a pair $(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x})$, where $\mathbf{k} \in J^{\mathbb{Z}}$.

In this paper we do not use global methods, so choosing local coordinates, we may assume that W_γ, $\gamma \in E$, are open sets in $\mathbb{R}^m$.

If the Lagrangians satisfy the twist condition

$$\det B_\kappa(x,y) \neq 0, \qquad B_\kappa(x,y) = \partial_x \partial_y L_\kappa(x,y),$$

then an edge $\gamma = (\kappa, \kappa')$ defines a local diffeomorphism

$$f_\gamma : \mathscr{D}_\gamma^- \to \mathscr{D}_\gamma^+$$

of open sets $\mathscr{D}_\gamma^\pm$ in $\mathbb{R}^{2m}$ by the equation

$$f_\gamma(x,y) = (y,z) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \partial_y(L_\kappa(x,y) + L_{\kappa'}(y,z)) = 0$$

Then the trajectory $(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{x})$ corresponds to a composition

$$(x_n, x_{n+1}) = f_{\gamma_n} \circ f_{\gamma_{n-1}} \circ \cdots \circ f_{\gamma_1}(x_0, x_1), \qquad \gamma_i = (\kappa_i, \kappa_{i-1}).$$

It is customary to represent such dynamics by a single map $\mathscr{F}$ by taking the skew product [52] of the maps $\{f_\gamma\}$. If the sets $U_\kappa^\pm$ lie in the configuration space M, then $\mathscr{F}$ a map of $(J \times M^2)^{\mathbb{Z}}$. But often this is not necessary: we can represent dynamics by a single self-map of a smooth manifold P.

We say that a dynamical system $F : P \to P$ is ambient of a DLS $\mathscr{L}$ if to every trajectory $(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{x})$ of $\mathscr{L}$ there corresponds a trajectory $\mathbf{z} = (z_i)_{\in\in\mathbb{Z}}$ of F. A formal definitions is as follows:

Definition 3.1 *The dynamical system $F : P \to P$ is said to be ambient for the DLS $\mathscr{L}$ if there exist two systems of open sets $\mathscr{P}_\gamma^\pm \subset P$ and the diffeomorphisms $\beta_\gamma^\pm : \mathscr{D}_\gamma^\pm \to \mathscr{P}_\gamma^\pm$ which conjugate f_γ with F. In other words, if the following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathscr{D}_\gamma^- & \xrightarrow{f_\gamma} & \mathscr{D}_\gamma^+ \\ {\scriptstyle\beta_\gamma^-}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\beta_\gamma^+} \\ \mathscr{P}_\gamma^- & \xrightarrow{F|_{\mathscr{P}_\gamma^-}} & \mathscr{P}_\gamma^+ \end{array}$$

Thus $\beta_\gamma^\pm$ are charts in P, and f_γ is a coordinate representation of F.

An ambient system exists under weak conditions on the DLS, but in general it is not unique. For globally defined DLS from Section 3.1 the ambient system is the map $T : M \times M \to M \times M$. The problem of building of the ambient system is not important for our purposes because we usually start with a dynamical system $F : P \to P$ and the corresponding DLS $\mathscr{L}$ is a technical tool for studying dynamics of F. A standard example is the Lagrangian representation of a symplectic map in the next section.

3.3 DLS generated by a symplectic map

A DLS determines a local (in general) symplectic map. Conversely, one can represent the dynamics of a symplectic map by a DLS, but the Lagrangian will be

only locally defined. Let

$$F : P \to P, \quad F^*\omega = \omega, \tag{3.11}$$

be a symplectic self-map of a symplectic $2m$-dimensional manifold (P,ω) [4].

Let (x^-,y^-) and (x^+,y^+) be symplectic coordinates in small neighborhoods D^- and D^+ of the points z^- and $z^+ = F(z^-)$:

$$\omega|_{D^-} = dy^- \wedge dx^-, \quad \omega|_{D^+} = dy^+ \wedge dx^+.$$

If $F(D^-) \cap D^+ \neq \emptyset$, the map F can be represented as

$$y^+ = y^+(x^-,y^-), \quad x^+ = x^+(x^-,y^-), \qquad dy_+ \wedge dx_+ = dy_- \wedge dx_-. \tag{3.12}$$

The coordinates can be chosen so that $\det(\partial y^+/\partial x^-) \neq 0$. Then $F : D^- \to D^+$ is locally determined by a generating function $L(x^-,x^+)$ on an open set $U^- \times U^+$:

$$y^- = \partial L/\partial x^-, \quad y^+ = -\partial L/\partial x^+.$$

Since the construction is local, we obtain a collection $\mathscr{L} = \{L_\kappa\}_{\kappa\in J}$ of generating functions defined on open sets $U^-_\kappa \times U^+_\kappa$. More precisely, take a collection of symplectic charts in P, i.e. open sets $\{D_k\}_{k\in I}$ and symplectic maps

$$\phi_k : D_k \to U_k \times \mathbb{R}^m, \quad U_k \subset \mathbb{R}^m, \qquad \phi_k^*(dy \wedge dx) = \omega|_{D_k}.$$

Let J be the set of $\kappa = (\kappa_-,\kappa_+) \in I^2$ such that $F(D_{\kappa_-}) \cap D_{\kappa_+} \neq \emptyset$. For any $\kappa \in J$, the map $F : D_{\kappa_-} \cap F^{-1}(D_{\kappa_+}) \to F(D_{\kappa_-}) \cap D_{\kappa_+}$ satisfies

$$F(x^-,y^-) = (x^+,y^+) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad y^+\,dx^+ - y^-\,dx^- = dL_\kappa$$

for some function L_κ. Changing coordinates if needed, we can locally express L_κ as a smooth function $L_\kappa(x^-,x^+)$ on a subset in $U_{\kappa_-} \times U_{\kappa_+}$. We obtain a DLS $\mathscr{L} = \{L_\kappa\}_{\kappa\in J}$. The corresponding graph has the set of vertices J, and there is an edge from κ to $\kappa' \in J$ if $\kappa_+ = \kappa'_-$.

An orbit $\mathbf{z} = (z_i)$ of F such that $z_i \in D_{k_i}$ for all i corresponds to a trajectory $(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{x})$ of the DLS. Here $x_i \in U_{k_i}$ and $\kappa_i = (k_i,k_{i+1})$. Any trajectory of $\mathscr{L}$ gives a unique trajectory of F.

If the charts $\{D_k\}_{k\in I}$ cover P then any trajectory of F corresponds to a trajectory (may be, not unique) of the DLS $\mathscr{L}$. However, in the majority of examples below $\cup_{k\in I} D_k \neq P$.

The map $F : P \to P$ determines an ambient dynamical system for the DLS $\mathscr{L}$. A concrete example is given in Section 5.4.

Remark 3.1 *There are other ways to represent trajectories of a symplectic map F by a DLS. If equations (3.12) can be solved for $y^-(x^-,y^+)$, then $F : D^- \to D^+$ can be locally represented by a generating function $S(x^-,y^+)$:*

$$F(x^-,y^-) = (x^+,y^+) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad dS(x^-,y^+) = y^- dx^- + x^+ dy^+.$$

We obtain a collection of functions S_κ which generate symplectic maps $F : D^-_\kappa \to D^+_\kappa$ of open sets in P. Define the discrete Lagrangian by

$$L_\kappa(z^-,z^+) = \langle x^-,y^-\rangle - S_\kappa(x^-,y^+), \quad z^\pm = (x^\pm,y^\pm).$$

Then orbits $\mathbf{z} = (z_i)$ of F are critical points of the Poincaré discrete action functional

$$\mathscr{A}_\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{z}) = \sum L_{\kappa_i}(z_i, z_{i+1}). \tag{3.13}$$

Thus $\mathbf{z}$ is a trajectory of a DLS with $2m$ degrees of freedom. This representation is standard in symplectic topology, see [4, 59].

3.4 DLS generated by a Lagrangian flow

DLS naturally appear in Lagrangian systems with continuous time (CLS). Consider a CLS with the Lagrangian $L(q,\dot q,t)$ on $TM \times \mathbb{R}$, where M is a smooth manifold (the configurational space). We assume that L satisfies the Legendre condition: the Legendre transform $\dot q \to p = \partial_{\dot q} L$ is a diffeomorphism. Then L defines a Lagrangian flow on TM or Hamiltonian flow ϕ^t with Hamiltonian $H(q,p,t) = \langle p,\dot q\rangle - L$ on T^*M.

If the Lagrangian is T-periodic in time, then dynamics is described by the monodromy (Poincaré) map $\phi^T : T^*M \to T^*M$. This map is symplectic and can be represented by a DLS. For Lagrangian systems this can be made more explicit.

Define Hamilton's action function as the action of a trajectory $\gamma : [0,T] \to M$ joining two points $x_-, x_+ \in M$:

$$S(x_-,x_+) = \int_0^T L(\gamma(t),\dot\gamma(t),t)\, dt.$$

If the end points $x_\pm$ are nonconjugate along γ, then S is locally well defined and smooth. By Hamilton's first variation formula, the initial and final momenta $p_- = p(0)$ and $p_+ = p(T)$ satisfy

$$p_+ dx_+ - p_- dx_- = dS(x_-,x_+). \tag{3.14}$$

Thus S is the local generating function of the monodromy map $(q_-, p_-) \mapsto (q_+, p_+)$.

In general there can be several trajectories joining x_- and x_+, so the function S is multivalued. Thus we have a collection of generating functions S_κ defined on open sets $U_\kappa^- \times U_\kappa^+ \subset M^2$. Let $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to M$ be a trajectory of the CLS and $x_i = \gamma(t_i)$, $t_i = Ti$. If the points x_i and x_{i+1} are nonconjugate along γ, then $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)$ is a trajectory of the DLS $\mathscr{L} = \{S_\kappa\}$. Under the Legendre condition, also the converse is true: a trajectory $\mathbf{x}$ of the DLS gives a trajectory γ of the CLS with the momentum satisfying

$$p(t_i + 0) = -\partial_{x_i} L_{\kappa_i}(x_i, x_{i+1}) = \partial_{x_i} L_{\kappa_{i-1}}(x_{i-1}, x_i) = p(t_i - 0).$$

Indeed, then the momentum determines the velocity and so $\Delta p(t_i) = 0$ implies $\Delta \dot\gamma(t_i) = 0$. Hence γ is smooth at t_i and so it is a trajectory of the CLS. Moreover the discrete action functional corresponds to the action functional: $\int_\gamma L\, dt = A_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x})$.

Remark 3.2 *This construction can be generalized. Take hypersurfaces $\{\Sigma_k\}_{k\in I}$ in $M \times \mathbb{R}$. For $\kappa = (\kappa_-, \kappa_+) \in I^2$ define the discrete Lagrangian $L_\kappa(x_-, x_+)$, $x_\pm = (q_\pm, t_\pm) \in \Sigma_{\kappa_\pm}$ as the action of a trajectory $\gamma : [t_-, t_+] \to M$ joining a pair of points q_-, q_+. In general there can be several such trajectories so we obtain a collection of Lagrangians defined on open sets in $\Sigma_{\kappa_-} \times \Sigma_{\kappa_+}$. We use this construction in Section 6.3.*

For autonomous systems, any $T > 0$ is a period and can be used to define the monodromy map ϕ^T. Then ϕ^T has the energy integral H and the symmetry group defined by the Hamiltonian flow ϕ^t. The corresponding DLS will have the energy integral and a (local) symmetry group. Hence this DLS will never be anti-integrable.

We can avoid this difficulty by replacing the monodromy map ϕ^T by the Poincaré map. Fix energy and consider a local cross-section N in the energy level $H = E$. We can do this by choosing a hypersurface $\Sigma \subset M$ (in applications $\Sigma = \cup \Sigma_k$ may be a union of several hypersurfaces) and setting

$$N = \{(q, p) : q \in \Sigma, H(q, p) = E\}. \tag{3.15}$$

This is a symplectic manifold and the Poincaré map $F : U \to N$ is a symplectic map of an open set $U \subset N$.

We represent F by a DLS with $m - 1$ degrees of freedom as follows. Define the discrete Lagrangian as the Maupertuis action

$$S(x_-, x_+) = \int_\gamma p\, dq, \qquad p = \partial_{\dot q} L,$$

of a trajectory $\gamma : [0,T] \to M$ with energy $H = E$ joining given points $x_\pm \in M$. Here $T = T(\gamma) > 0$ is arbitrary. The action S is smooth provided $x_\pm$ are nonconjugate along γ for the Maupertuis action functional. The action satisfies (3.14) but the Hamilton–Jacobi equation $H(x_+, \partial_{x_+} S) = E$ implies that the twist condition always fails.

A trajectory γ not always exists, and there can be several of them, so we obtain a collection of discrete Lagrangians S_κ on open sets $U_\kappa^- \times U_\kappa^+ \subset M^2$. Take a hypersurface $\Sigma \subset M$ and set $\Sigma_\kappa^\pm = \Sigma \cap U_\kappa^\pm$. Then $L_\kappa = S_\kappa|_{\Sigma_\kappa^- \times \Sigma_\kappa^+}$ is a local generating function of the Poincaré map of the cross section (3.15). Thus $\mathscr{L} = \{L_\kappa\}$ is a DLS describing trajectories of the continuous Lagrangian system on the energy level $H = E$. If $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to M$ is a trajectory with $H = E$ such that $\gamma(t_i) \in \Sigma$ and x_i, x_{i+1} are nonconjugate (for fixed energy) along γ, then $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)$ is a trajectory of the DLS.

Note that not all trajectories of the DLS correspond to trajectories of the continuous Lagrangian system: some correspond to billiard trajectories with elastic reflection from Σ. Indeed, for given $x \in \Sigma$, the equations

$$H(x,p) = H(x,p'), \quad \Delta p = p' - p_- \perp T_x\Sigma,$$

do not imply $p' = p$. If H is convex in p, there are 2 solutions for p': one describing elastic reflection from Σ and the other ($p' = p$) a smooth trajectory.

However, in the local problems discussed in this paper this difficulty does not appear: locally equations above have unique solution.

4 Anti-integrable limit in DLS

4.1 Main theorem

The original idea of AI limit [6] was extended in various directions. The case of multidimensional standard map was considered in [57] and other papers, see the references in [42]. General equivariant case is presented in [70]. Billiard systems with small convex scatterers are studied in [30]. A particle with a small mass in a potential force field as a continuous Lagrangian system near AI limit is treated in [18]. Other examples and references can be found in Section 6. In this section we present a general approach to AI limit in DLS which covers essentially all known examples.

Consider a DLS $\mathscr{L} = \{L_\kappa\}_{\kappa \in J}$ as defined in Section 3.2. In the AI limit the

Lagrangians are small perturbations of twistless Lagrangians L^0_κ:

$$L_\kappa(x,y) = L^0_\kappa(x,y) + u_\kappa(x,y), \qquad \kappa \in J,$$

where the function u_κ is small in the C^2 norm and L^0_κ has identically zero twist: $B^0_\kappa(x,y) \equiv 0$. Then

$$L^0_\kappa(x,y) = V^-_\kappa(x) + V^+_\kappa(y),$$

where the functions $V^\pm_\kappa$ are defined on the sets $U^\pm_\kappa$ respectively.

Define an oriented graph Γ with the set of vertices J and the set of edges E as follows. We join the vertices $\kappa, \kappa' \in J$ with an edge $\gamma = (\kappa, \kappa')$ if $W_\gamma = U^+_\kappa \cap U^-_{\kappa'} \neq \emptyset$ and the function $\Psi_\gamma = V^+_\kappa + V^-_{\kappa'}$ on W_γ has a nondegenerate critical point. Then to each edge $\gamma = (\kappa, \kappa') \in E$ joining vertices $\kappa, \kappa' \in J$ there corresponds a nondegenerate critical point a_γ of the function Ψ_γ.

Remark 4.1 *In many applications for given κ, κ' the critical point a_γ will be unique. If there are several nondegenerate critical points we join κ, κ' by several edges γ, and to each of them there corresponds the nondegenerate critical point a_γ. In this case Γ is not a simple graph: there are several edges γ joining two vertices κ, κ'. Theorem 4.1 and its proof still work, but a path in the graph will mean a sequence of edges, not vertices.*

According to the traditional definition, a path in the graph Γ is a sequence of vertices $\mathbf{k} = (\kappa_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$. It defines a sequence of edges $(\gamma_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$, where γ_i joins the vertex κ_{i-1} with κ_i. The corresponding sequence of critical points

$$\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{k}) = (a_{\gamma_i})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}.$$

is a trajectory of the twistless Lagrangian system $\mathscr{L}^0 = \{L^0_\kappa\}$ i.e. a critical point of the uncoupled action functional:

$$A^0_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{\gamma_i}(x_i). \tag{4.1}$$

The set $\Pi \subset J^{\mathbb{Z}}$ of all paths is invariant under the shift $\mathscr{T} : \Pi \to \Pi$, $(\kappa_i) \to (\kappa_{i+1})$. For simplicity suppose that the graph Γ is finite. The general case is discussed later in Section 4.3. Under this assumption the set Π of all paths is a compact shift invariant subset in the Cantor set $J^{\mathbb{Z}}$. The dynamical system $\mathscr{T} : \Pi \to \Pi$ is called a topological Markov chain or a subshift of finite type [52]. When the graph is complete, i.e. $\Pi = J^{\mathbb{Z}}$, this is the Bernoulli shift with $\#J$ symbols.

Theorem 4.1 *Suppose $\#\Gamma < \infty$. Then there exist $C, \varepsilon_0, \sigma > 0$ such that if*

$$\varepsilon = \max_{\kappa} \|u_\kappa\|_{C^2} < \varepsilon_0, \tag{4.2}$$

then the following is true.

(a) *For any path $\mathbf{k} = (\kappa_i)$ in Γ, there exists a unique orbit $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{k}) = (x_i)$ of the DLS $\mathscr{L}$ which shadows the sequence $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{k})$:*

$$\rho(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a}) = \sup_i \operatorname{dist}(x_i, a_{\gamma_i}) < \sigma.$$

Moreover $\rho(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a}) < C\varepsilon$.

(b) *The orbit $\mathbf{x}$ is hyperbolic with Lyapunov exponent $\lambda \geq C|\log \varepsilon|$.*

(c) *The map $\mathbf{k} \mapsto \mathbf{x}$ is continuous, so $\Lambda = \{(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x}(\mathbf{k})) : \mathbf{k} \in \Pi\}$ is a compact set in $J^{\mathbb{Z}} \times (\mathbb{R}^m)^{\mathbb{Z}}$.*

Remark 4.2 *The assumption that Ψ_γ has a nondegenerate critical point can be weakened. For example, for the existence of a shadowing trajectory it is sufficient that Ψ_γ has a compact set of minimum points in W_γ. However, then the shadowing orbit may be not unique or hyperbolic. Further generalizations can be obtained by variational methods of Mather, see [58].*

If the graph Γ is branched, i.e. there are 2 cycles through the same vertex, then $\mathscr{T} : \Lambda \to \Lambda$ has positive topological entropy. If the DLS admits an ambient system $F : P \to P$, we obtain a homeomorphism $\Pi \to \Lambda \to \mathscr{K}$ onto a compact hyperbolic set $\mathscr{K} \subset P$, and $F : \mathscr{K} \to \mathscr{K}$ is conjugate to the topological Markov chain $\mathscr{T} : \Pi \to \Pi$. In this case we have the following

Corollary 4.1 *If the graph Γ is branched, then the set $\mathscr{K}$ has positive topological entropy satisfying (2.18).*

Remark 4.3 *For our purposes only the local existence of the ambient system in a neighborhood of the hyperbolic set is needed. Thus only the local twist condition is required:*

$$\det B_\kappa(a_\gamma, a_{\gamma'}) \neq 0$$

for any two edges such that γ ends at κ and γ' starts at κ.

Theorem 4.1 does not require the twist condition. Hence, we have to generalize the usual definition of hyperbolicity. Indeed, without the twist condition the

present state of a trajectory does not determine the past and the future so the usual definition of the stable (contracting) and unstable (expanding) subspaces does not work. We reformulate the cone hyperbolicity criterion of V.M. Alexeyev [52].

Linearization of equation (3.10) at $\mathbf{x}$ yields the variational equation of the trajectory $(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{x})$:

$$G_{i-}u_{i-1} + G_i u_i + G_{i+}u_{i+1} = 0, \tag{4.3}$$

where G_i and $G_{i\pm}$ are linear operators. We define the cones

$$H_i = \big\{(u_i,u_{i+1}) : \|u_i\| \le \alpha_H \|u_{i+1}\|\big\}, \tag{4.4}$$
$$V_i = \big\{(u_i,u_{i+1}) : \|u_{i+1}\| \le \alpha_V \|u_i\|\big\}. \tag{4.5}$$

We say that $(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{x})$ is hyperbolic if there exists $\mu > 1$ such that for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and for any u_{i-1}, u_i, u_{i+1} satisfying (4.3)

$$(u_{i-1},u_i) \in H_{i-1} \quad \text{implies} \quad (u_i,u_{i+1}) \in H_i \text{ and } \|(u_i,u_{i+1})\| \ge \mu \|(u_{i-1},u_i)\|, \tag{4.6}$$
$$(u_i,u_{i+1}) \in V_i \quad \text{implies} \quad (u_{i-1},u_i) \in V_{i-1} \text{ and } \|(u_{i-1},u_i)\| \ge \mu \|(u_i,u_{i+1})\| \tag{4.7}$$

The cone definition has this form only for a good choice of the metric. But this is not important for us because we use it only as a sufficient condition for hyperbolicity.

If $(u_i,u_{i+1}) \in H_i$, then $\|(u_j,u_{j+1})\| \ge \mu^{j-i}\|(u_i,u_{i+1})\|$ for $j \ge i$, so the Lyapunov exponent is at least $\log\mu$.

We say that a compact $\mathscr{T}$-invariant set Λ of trajectories $(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{x})$ is hyperbolic if every trajectory $(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{x})$ in Λ satisfies conditions above with the same constants. If a DLS admits an ambient system, then the corresponding compact invariant set $\mathscr{K} \subset P$ is hyperbolic in the traditional [52] sense.

Remark 4.4 *Another condition for hyperbolicity for* $(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{x})$ *is that the Hessian operator* $A''_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}) : l_\infty(\mathbb{R}^m) \to l_\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$ *defined by the right hand side of the variational equation has bounded inverse in the* l_∞ *norm. The equivalence of these definitions was proved in [7].*

4.2 Proof of Theorem 4.1

The proof of Theorem 4.1 is almost the same as for the Standard map. By the implicit function theorem for any edge $\gamma = (\kappa,\kappa') \in E$ joining $\kappa,\kappa' \in J$ the map

$g_\gamma = D\Psi_\gamma$ is a diffeomorphism from a neighborhood W_γ of a_γ to a neighborhood of the origin in $\mathbb{R}^m$. We may assume that

$$W_\gamma = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m : |x - a_\gamma| < r\}. \tag{4.8}$$

Here $r > 0$ can be taken independent of γ because the graph Γ is finite. Let ϕ_γ denote the inverse map: $\phi_\gamma = g_\gamma^{-1}$. Then $\phi_\gamma(0) = a_\gamma$.

Let $\mathbf{k} = (\kappa_i)$ be a path in the graph Γ and (γ_i) the corresponding sequence of edges. Consider the metric space (X, ρ), where $X = \prod_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} W_{\gamma_i}$ and for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in X$

$$\rho(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \sup_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} |x_i - x_i'|.$$

A trajectory $\mathbf{x}$ is a critical point of the functional $A_\mathbf{k}$ in a neighborhood of $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{k})$ in X iff

$$x_i = \phi_{\gamma_i}\big(\partial_{x_i}\big(u_{\kappa_{i-1}}(x_{i-1}, x_i) + u_{\kappa_i}(x_i, x_{i+1})\big)\big). \tag{4.9}$$

It remains to apply contraction principle in a neighborhood of the point $\mathbf{a}$ in X. Let $\mathscr{B} \subset X$ be the ball

$$\mathscr{B} = \{\mathbf{x} \in X : \rho(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a}) \le \sigma\}, \qquad \sigma < r.$$

Consider the operator $\Phi : \mathscr{B}_\sigma \to X$,

$$\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{y} = \Phi(\mathbf{x}), \quad y_i = \phi_{\gamma_i}\big(\partial_{x_i}\big(u_{\kappa_{i-1}}(x_{i-1}, x_i) + u_{\kappa_i}(x_i, x_{i+1})\big)\big).$$

Any fixed point of Φ is a trajectory of the DLS $\mathscr{L}$.

As in Section 2 it is easy to show that if ε is sufficiently small, $\Phi(\mathscr{B}_\sigma) \subset \mathscr{B}_\sigma$ and Φ is contracting. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{a}) &= \sup_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \big|\phi_{\gamma_i}\big(\partial_{x_i}\big(u_{\kappa_{i-1}}(x_{i-1}, x_i) + u_{\kappa_i}(x_i, x_{i+1})\big)\big) - \phi_{\gamma_i}(0)\big| \\
&\le \lambda \sup_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \big|\partial_{x_i}\big(u_{\kappa_{i-1}}(x_{i-1}, x_i) + u_{\kappa_i}(x_i, x_{i+1})\big)\big| \le 2\lambda\varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{B}_\sigma$ if we set $\sigma = 2\lambda\varepsilon$.

We put $\mathbf{y} = \Phi(\mathbf{x})$, $\mathbf{y}' = \Phi(\mathbf{x}')$, $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathscr{B}_\sigma$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}') &= \sup_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \big|\phi_{\gamma_i}\big(\partial_{x_i}\big(u_{\kappa_{i-1}}(x_{i-1}, x_i) + u_{\kappa_i}(x_i, x_{i+1})\big)\big) \\
&\qquad - \phi_{\gamma_i}\big(\partial_{x_i'}\big(u_{\kappa_{i-1}}(x_{i-1}', x_i') + u_{\kappa_i}(x_i', x_{i+1}')\big)\big)\big| \\
&\le \lambda \sup_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \big|\partial_{x_i}\big(u_{\kappa_{i-1}}(x_{i-1}, x_i) + u_{\kappa_i}(x_i, x_{i+1})\big) - \partial_{x_i'}\big(u_{\kappa_{i-1}}(x_{i-1}', x_i') + u_{\kappa_i}(x_i', x_{i+1}')\big)\big| \\
&\le 2\lambda\varepsilon\rho(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}').
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, Φ is contracting for $\varepsilon < 1/(2\lambda)$.

Now we prove assertion **(b)**. We take in (4.4)–(4.5) $\alpha_H = \alpha_V = 1/2$. Let $\mathbf{x}$ be the orbit corresponding to $\mathbf{k} \in \Pi$ by assertion **(a)**. Differentiating (4.9), we have:

$$u_i = P_i u_{i-1} + Q_i u_i + R_i u_{i-1}. \tag{4.10}$$

This equation is equivalent to (4.3).

Norms of the linear operators P_i, Q_i, R_i are small:

$$\|P_i\| \le \lambda\varepsilon, \quad \|Q_i\| \le \lambda\varepsilon, \quad \|R_i\| \le \lambda\varepsilon.$$

The equations

$$R_i u_{i+1} = (I - Q_i)u_i - P_i u_{i-1}, \quad (u_{i-1}, u_i) \in H_{i-1}$$

imply

$$\frac{|u_i|}{|u_{i+1}|} \le \frac{|(I-Q_i)u_i - P_i u_{i-1}|}{(1 - \|Q_i\| - \|P_i\|/2)\cdot|u_{i+1}|} \le \frac{|R_i u_{i+1}|}{(1-3\varepsilon\lambda/2)\cdot|u_{i+1}|} \le \frac{\varepsilon\lambda}{1-3\varepsilon\lambda/2}.$$

Therefore

$$(u_i, u_{i+1}) \in H_i \quad \text{provided} \quad \frac{\varepsilon\lambda}{1-3\varepsilon\lambda/2} < \frac{1}{2}.$$

This implies the first assertion (4.6). We also have:

$$\|(u_{i-1}, u_i)\|^2 \le |u_{i-1}|^2 + \frac{|(I-Q_i)u_i - P_i u_{i-1}|^2}{(1-\|Q\|-\|P\|/2)^2} \le \frac{|u_i|^2}{4} + \frac{\varepsilon^2\lambda^2|u_{i+1}|^2}{(1-3\varepsilon\lambda/2)^2} \le \frac{1}{4}\|(u_i, u_{i+1})\|^2$$

provided $\frac{\varepsilon\lambda}{1-3\varepsilon\lambda} < \frac{1}{2}$. Hence we have the second assertion (4.6) with $\mu = 2$. Assertions (4.7) can be checked analogously.

Now we prove **(c)**. If two codes $\mathbf{k}$ and $\mathbf{k}'$ are close in the product topology in $J^{\mathbb{Z}}$, they have a long identical segment: $\kappa_i = \kappa'_i$ for $|i| \le n$. Then the corresponding trajectories $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{x}'$ satisfy

$$|x_i - x'_i| \le C\alpha^{|i|-n}, \qquad 0 < \alpha < 1, \quad |i| \le n.$$

This follows from (4.9) as in the proof of Lemma 2.2. If n is large, $\mathbf{x}$ is close to $\mathbf{x}'$ in the product topology. Hence the map $\mathbf{k} \mapsto \mathbf{x}$ is continuous. ∎

Another way to check hyperbolicity is to show that the Hessian $A''_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x})$ has bounded inverse in the $l^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$ norm. Since it is 3-diagonal with invertible diagonal and small off diagonal terms, this is almost evident. We can also describe the stable and unstable subspaces of the hyperbolic trajectory.

Proposition 4.1 *For any $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$ there exists a unique trajectory $\mathbf{u} = (u_j)_{j\geq 0}$ of the variational system such that $u_0 = u$ and $\|u_j\|$ is bounded as $j \to \infty$. The trajectory $\mathbf{u}$ exponentially tends to zero: $\|u_j\| \leq \mu^{-j}\|u\|$, $\mu > 1$. Thus $\mathbf{u}$ belongs to the stable subspace of the trajectory $(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x})$. Similarly for the unstable subspace.*

The proof of Proposition 4.1 is obtained by the same contracting mapping argument applied to the map

$$(u_i)_{i>0} \mapsto (v_i)_{i>0}, \qquad v_i = P_i u_{i-1} + Q_i u_i + R_i u_{i-1}, \quad u_0 = u,$$

(see (4.10)) on the space of bounded sequences $(u_j)_{j>0}$.

4.3 G-equivariant DLS

In many applications we use anti-integrable limit to construct trajectories going to infinity. Then we have to consider infinite graphs Γ. In the case of an infinite graph Γ we need a certain uniformity.

U: Uniform anti-integrability. There exist positive constants r and λ such that for any $\gamma \in E$,

(a) $g_\gamma : W_\gamma \to B_\gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is a diffeomorphism where B_γ is a neighborhood of the origin and W_γ is determined by (4.8) with $r > 0$ independent of γ.

(b) the map $\phi_\gamma = {g_\gamma}^{-1} : B_\gamma \to W_\gamma$ is Lipschits with Lipschits constant λ.

(c) $\varepsilon = \sup_{\kappa \in J} \|u_\kappa\|_{C^2}$ is finite and sufficiently small.

Obviously, condition **U** holds if Γ is finite.

Theorem 4.2 *Theorem 4.1 remains true for an infinite graph Γ if the DLS is uniformly anti-integrable.*

The proof coincides with the proof of Theorem 4.1. ∎

Condition **U** is a restrictive assumption. In this section we present a class of discrete Lagrangian systems with $\#E = \infty$ where **U** requires a finitely many conditions to hold.

Suppose that a discrete group G acts on M.[5] We assume that the action is discrete: any point $x \in M$ has a neighborhood U such that the sets $g(U)$, $g \in G$, do not intersect: $g'(U) \cap g''(U) = \emptyset$ for $g' \neq g''$. In this case the quotient space $\widetilde{M} = M/G$ is a smooth manifold and $\pi : M \to \widetilde{M}$ is a covering. The action of G on

[5] i.e. there is a homomorphism of the group G to the group of diffeomorphisms of M.

M generates the diagonal action of G on the product $M \times M$: for any pair $x, y \in M$ and $g \in G$ we have $g(x,y) = (g(x), g(y))$.

Let $L : M \times M \to \mathbb{R}$ be invariant with respect to the action of G:

$$L(x,y) = L(g(x,y)) \qquad \text{for all} \quad x,y \in M \quad \text{and } g \in G.$$

The corresponding DLS is called G-equivariant. The ambient system here may be defined as a map $F : P \to P$ of $P = (M \times M)/G$. In the case of the multidimensional standard map with the Lagrangian (3.6) we have $M = \mathbb{R}^m$ and $G \cong \mathbb{Z}^m$ is the group of shifts preserving the potential V.

As another example suppose that M is a Riemannian manifold and the group G acts on M by isometries. Let $\mathrm{dist}(\cdot,\cdot)$ be the distance induced by the Riemannian metric. Then the Lagrangian $L(x,y) = \mathrm{dist}^2(x,y)$ is a smooth function for any pair of sufficiently close points x, y. It is invariant with respect to the diagonal action of G.

The function $z = z(x,y)$ (see (3.1)) in this example has a simple geometric meaning. Suppose there exists a unique shortest geodesic $\gamma : [0,1] \to M$ joining x with z (for example, the points x, z are close to one another). Then $y = \gamma(1/2)$ is situated on the same geodesic, y lies between x and z and

$$\mathrm{dist}\,(x,y) = \mathrm{dist}\,(y,z) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{dist}\,(x,z).$$

For smooth G-invariant functions $V : M \to \mathbb{R}$ and $u : M \times M \to \mathbb{R}$ consider the DLS, determined by the discrete Lagrangian L

$$L(x,y) = u(x,y) + V(y).$$

We define the AI limit in such a system as the limit $\|u\|_{C^2} \to 0$.

Suppose that the configurational space $\widetilde{M} = M/G$ is compact. We fix a Riemannian metric on $\widetilde{M}$ which is pulled back up to a G-invariant metric on M. Let dist be the corresponding distance on M.

Take a finite set of nondegenerate critical points of V on $\tilde{M}$, and let I the corresponding G-invariant set of critical points of V on M. The latter is a finite union of the orbits

$$\{g(k) : g \in G\}, \qquad k \in I,$$

of the group action.

Taking a large constant N we define the graph Γ with the set of vertices J and the set of edges E:

$$J = \left\{\kappa = (\kappa_-, \kappa_+) \in I^2 : \mathrm{dist}(\kappa_-, \kappa_+) < N\right\}, \quad E = \left\{\gamma = (\kappa, \kappa') \in J^2 : \kappa_+ = \kappa'_-\right\}.$$

To make notations consistent with the notation of Section 4.1, we introduce the DLS $\mathscr{L}$ as follows. Take small G-invariant ρ-neighborhood of $U = \cup_{k\in I} U_k$ of the set I in M. Then for $\kappa \in J$ set

$$L_\kappa = L|_{U_{\kappa_-}\times U_{\kappa_+}}, \quad V_\kappa^- = 0, \quad V_\kappa^+ = V|_{U_{\kappa_+}}, \quad u_\kappa = u|_{U_{\kappa_-}\times U_{\kappa_+}}$$

If the group G is infinite, the graph Γ is infinite, but due to G-invariance of L, condition **U** follows from finiteness of the set Cr and boundedness of N. One can notice that G acts on Γ as well and $\tilde{\Gamma} = \Gamma/G$ is a finite graph. Then we obtain:

Proposition 4.2 *The map F has a hyperbolic set K such that $F|_K$ is conjugate to the topological Markov chain determined by the graph Γ.*

In fact we need only the local existence of the ambient system near the hyperbolic set. It will exist provided $\det B(\kappa_-,\kappa_+) \neq 0$ for all $(\kappa_-,\kappa_+) \in J$.

Note that if M is not compact, M^2/G is also not compact, but the set $\mathscr{K}$ is compact because all its points are located on a distance less than $N+\sigma$ from the compact set $\{(x,x) \in M^2\}/G$.

5 Examples: systems with discrete time

5.1 Light particle and periodic kiks

Consider a particle with a small mass ε^2 which moves in the space $\mathbb{R}^m$ in the force field with potential

$$\mathscr{V}(x,t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} V(x)\delta(t), \tag{5.1}$$

where the function V is smooth on $\mathbb{R}^m$ and δ is the periodic δ-function:

$$\delta(t) = \begin{cases} \infty, & t \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}, \\ 0, & t \in \mathbb{R}\setminus 2\pi\mathbb{Z} \end{cases}, \qquad \int_{2\pi k-\sigma}^{2\pi k+\sigma} \delta(t)\,dt = 1 \quad \text{for any } k \in \mathbb{Z},\ \sigma \in (0,\pi).$$

The Hamiltonian of the system has the form $H = \frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2}|p|^2 + \frac{1}{2\pi}V(x)\delta(t)$, where $p = (p_1,\dots,p_m)$ is the momentum canonically conjugate to the coordinates $x = (x_1,\dots,x_m)$. The Hamiltonian equations read

$$\dot{p} = -\frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{\partial V}{\partial x}(x)\delta(t), \quad \dot{x} = \frac{p}{\varepsilon^2}.$$

Therefore p gets increments $-(2\pi)^{-1}\partial V/\partial x$ at the time moments $2\pi l$, $l \in \mathbb{Z}$. During the remaining time the particle is free.

For any integer l we put $x(2\pi l - 0) = x_l$, $p(2\pi l - 0) = p_l$. Then

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_l \\ p_l \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} x(2\pi l + 0) \\ p(2\pi l + 0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_l \\ p_l - \frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{\partial V}{\partial x}(x_l) \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\mapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_{l+1} \\ p_{l+1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_l + 2\pi\varepsilon^{-2} p_{l+1} \\ p_l - \frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{\partial V}{\partial x}(x_l) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The quantities x_{l-1}, x_l, x_{l+1} satisfy the equation $x_{l+1} - 2x_l + x_{l-1} = \varepsilon^{-2}\frac{\partial V}{\partial x}(x_l)$. We have a DLS with the Lagrangian which has the form (3.6), where $B = \varepsilon^2 I$.

$$L(x,y) = \varepsilon^2 \frac{|x-y|^2}{2} - V(y). \tag{5.2}$$

The corresponding discrete dynamical system is the multidimensional standard map. By Theorem 4.1 if V has two nondegenerate critical points, then for small ε the system has a chaotic hyperbolic set. If V is $\mathbb{Z}$-periodic on $\mathbb{R}^m$, then we have an $\mathbb{Z}$-equivariant DLS corresponding to a symplectic twist self-map of $\mathbb{T}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m$.

Note that for small ε the system remains close to the AI limit if the potential V is a smooth periodic function close (as a distribution) to (5.1).

If a light particle travels in a potential force field, where the potential $V(x,t)$ does not satisfy (5.1), the theory of the AI limit becomes technically more complicated. We discuss these results in Section 6.3.

5.2 Billiard in a wide strip

Consider a plane billiard system in a wide strip bounded by graphs of two 1-periodic functions. In other words, we assume that a particle moves in the domain

$$D = \{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : f_1(x) \le y \le f_2(x) + d\},$$

where f_1, f_2 are 1-periodic functions and the parameter d is large (Fig. 1). The motion of the particle inside the domain is assumed to be free. Reflections from the boundary are elastic.

This is a billiard system (see Section 3.1). Let L be the length of the line segment between two subsequent points of the impact with the boundary. We will consider motions such that the particle collides alternately with the upper and lower walls.



Figure 1: Billiard in a wide strip.

Let x_1 be the coordinate on the lower boundary and x_2 on the upper one. The length of the corresponding line segment is

$$L(x_1,x_2) = \sqrt{(x_2-x_1)^2+(d+f_2(x_2)-f_1(x_1))^2}.$$

The Lagrangian is $\mathbb{Z}$-invariant and for large d,

$$L(x_1,x_2) = d+f_2(x_2)-f_1(x_1)+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}(x_2-x_1)^2+O(\varepsilon^2), \qquad d=\varepsilon^{-1},$$

it has the form (3.6). The action functional has the form

$$A(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \big(L(x_{2i-1},x_{2i})+L(x_{2i+1},x_{2i})\big).$$

In the notation of section 3.2 we have a DLS $\mathscr{L} = \{L_1,L_2\}$ with the configuration space $M = \mathbb{R}_1 \cup \mathbb{R}_2$ a union of two copies of $\mathbb{R}$ and the Lagrangians $L_1(x_1,x_2) = L(x_1,x_2)$ and $L_2(x_2,x_1) = L(x_1,x_2)$. The action functional

$$A(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} L_{\kappa_i}(x_i,x_{i+1}) = \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} (d+2(-1)^i f_{\kappa_i}(x_i)+O(\varepsilon)), \qquad \kappa_i = i \bmod 2,$$

has the uncoupled form (4.1). Thus the DLS is anti-integrable provided both functions f_1 and f_2 have nondegenerate critical points. Let $\mathrm{Cr}_1 \subset \mathbb{R}_1$ and $\mathrm{Cr}_2 \subset \mathbb{R}_2$ denote the $\mathbb{Z}$-invariant sets of nondegenerate critical points of f_1 and f_2. Suppose that the sets $\mathrm{Cr}_1/\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathrm{Cr}_2/\mathbb{Z}$ are finite and nonempty.

The corresponding graph Γ has vertices of two types: $J = J_1 \cup J_2$

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= \big\{(\kappa,x,y) \in \{1\}\times \mathrm{Cr}_1 \times \mathrm{Cr}_2 : |x-y| < N\big\}, \\ J_2 &= \big\{(\kappa,x,y) \in \{2\}\times \mathrm{Cr}_2 \times \mathrm{Cr}_1 : |x-y| < N\big\}. \end{aligned}$$

There is an edge from the vertex (κ, x, y) and (κ', x', y') if and only if $\kappa \neq \kappa'$ and $y = x'$.

As in the standard equivariant situation (Section 4.3) we obtain the existence of a hyperbolic set carrying dynamics conjugated to the dynamics in a topological Markov chain. The graph Γ is infinite, but the condition of uniform anti-integrability holds.

Multidimensional analog of this system is straightforward: it is sufficient to say that $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and the functions f_1, f_2 are periodic in all components of the vector variable x.

5.3 Billiard systems with small scatterers

Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ be a domain with smooth boundary $\Sigma = \partial D$. Following [30], consider a billiard system in the domain $\Omega_\varepsilon = D \setminus (\cup_{j=1}^N D_j)$, where $D_j \subset D$ are small subdomains which play the role of scatterers. They are small in the following sense. Each domain D_j is associated with some point $a_j \in D$. The boundary ∂D_j is

$$a_j + \varepsilon\Sigma_j = \{q \in \mathbb{R}^m : q = a_j + \varepsilon\phi_j(x),\ x \in S^{m-1}\},$$

where the vector-functions $\phi_j : S^{m-1} \to \mathbb{R}^m$ are smooth embeddings which define smooth submanifolds $\Sigma_j = \phi_j(S^{m-1})$. If ε is sufficiently small, then $D_j \subset D$. When $\varepsilon \to 0$, Ω_ε degenerates to $\Omega_0 = D \setminus A$, where $A = \{a_1, \ldots, a_N\}$.

We plan to explain that for small ε this billiard system generates a DLS with the discrete Lagrangian $\mathscr{L} = \{L_\kappa\}$, where the index κ corresponds to a nondegenerate trajectory of a billiard in D starting and ending in A, see Fig. 2.



Figure 2: An orbit of the billiard in Ω_0.

Consider a billiard trajectory κ in D starting and ending at the points $a_i, a_j \in A$.

It may be a segment $\kappa = (a_i, a_j)$ joining a_i and a_j, or a broken line

$$\kappa = (a_i, p_1, \ldots, p_n, a_j), p_1, \ldots, p_n \in \Sigma, \tag{5.3}$$

joining the points $a_i, p_1, \ldots, p_n, a_j$. Then $(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ is a critical point of the length function

$$l(a_i, p_1, \ldots, p_n, a_j) = |a_i - p_1| + |p_1 - p_2| + \ldots + |p_{n-1} - p_n| + |p_n - a_j|$$

on Σ^n. The trajectory κ is called nondegenerate if $n = 0$ or the critical point $(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ is nondegenerate. We call the broken line (5.3) a quasi-trajectory if it is nondegenerate and, except the end points a_i and a_j, contains no point from the set A.

We denote by $a_\kappa^- = a_i$ and $a_\kappa^+ = a_j$ the initial and final points of the quasitrajectory, and by v_κ^- and v_κ^+ its initial and final velocity vectors issuing from the points a_i and a_j respectively:

$$v_\kappa^- = \frac{p_1 - a_i}{|p_1 - a_i|}, \quad v_\kappa^+ = \frac{a_j - p_n}{|a_j - p_n|}.$$

In the case $n = 0$ we should take $v_\kappa^- = v_\kappa^+ = (a_j - a_i)/|a_j - a_i|$.

If D is convex, there always exist nondegenerate quasitrajectories with $n = 0$ joining a_i and a_j. There also always exist quasitrajectories with $n = 1$ corresponding to the minimum of l on Σ. Generically, they will be nondegenerate.

For $m = 2$, by using the same argument as in the Birkhoff theorem [13] on periodic trajectories of a convex billiard (see also [55]), it is easy to show that, if D is convex, then for any $n \geq 1$ there are at least $2n$ orbits (5.3).

Any nondegenerate trajectory (5.3) is smoothly deformed when we slightly change its starting and end points. Hence for small $\varepsilon \geq 0$ there exist smooth functions

$$p_1(x,y), \ldots, p_n(x,y), \qquad x, y \in S^{m-1},$$

such that

$$B_\varepsilon(x,y) = \big(a_i + \varepsilon\phi_i(x), p_1(x,y), \ldots, p_n(x,y), a_j + \varepsilon\phi_j(y)\big)$$

is a trajectory of the billiard in D which coincides with κ when $\varepsilon = 0$. It will be contained in Ω_ε provided the only common points of $B_\varepsilon(x,y)$ with $\partial\Omega_\varepsilon$ are the end points $a_i + \varepsilon q_i(x)$ and $a_j + \varepsilon q_j(y)$. This holds if ε is sufficiently small and $x \in U_\kappa^-$, $y \in U_\kappa^+$, where $U_\kappa^\pm \subset S^{m-1}$ are some open sets, see Fig. 3. For example,



Figure 3: The bold part of the boundary ∂D_i is $a_i + \varepsilon\phi_i(U_\kappa^-)$.

U_κ^- is the set of x such that the ray starting at $\phi_i(x)$ in the direction of v_κ^- does not cross Σ_i.

The discrete Lagrangian corresponding to κ is

$$\begin{aligned} L_\kappa(x,y) &= \varepsilon^{-1} l(B_\varepsilon) \\ &= \varepsilon^{-1}\big|a_i - p_1(x,y) + \varepsilon\phi_i(x)\big| + \varepsilon^{-1}\big|p_1(x,y) - p_2(x,y)\big| + \dots \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^{-1}\big|p_{n-1}(x,y) - p_n(x,y)\big| + \varepsilon^{-1}\big|p_n(x,y) - a_j - \varepsilon\phi_j(y)\big|. \end{aligned}$$

Let us show that

$$L_\kappa(x,y) = \varepsilon^{-1} l(\kappa) + \langle v_\kappa^+, \phi_i(x)\rangle - \langle v_\kappa^-, \phi_j(y)\rangle + O(\varepsilon), \qquad (x,y) \in S^{m-1} \times S^{m-1}.$$

Indeed, by Hamilton's first variation formula,

$$dl(B_\varepsilon) = v_\kappa^+\, dq_+ - v_\kappa^-\, dq_-, \qquad dq_- = \phi_i(x)\, d\varepsilon, \quad dq_+ = \phi_j(y)\, d\varepsilon.$$

Therefore

$$\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial\varepsilon}\right|_{\varepsilon=0} l(B_\varepsilon) = \langle v_\kappa^+, \phi_j(y)\rangle - \langle v_\kappa^-, \phi_i(x)\rangle.$$

Let the set of vertices of the graph Γ be a finite collection of quasitrajectories $J = \{\kappa\}$. We connect vertices κ and κ' with an edge provided

1. end of κ is the start of κ': $a_\kappa^+ = a_{\kappa'}^- = a_k \in A$,
2. direction change: $v_\kappa^+ \neq v_{\kappa'}^-$.

   If Σ_k is strictly convex, no more conditions are needed. If not, we need one more. Let $v \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be the unit vector

$$v = \frac{v_{\kappa'}^- - v_\kappa^+}{|v_{\kappa'}^- - v_\kappa^+|},$$

see Fig. 4. There always exists $s \in S^{m-1}$ such that v is the outer normal to the tangent plane $T_{\phi_k(s)}\Sigma_k$ and $s \in U^+_\kappa \cap U^-_{\kappa'}$.



Figure 4: The vectors v^+_κ, $v^-_{\kappa'}$ and v.

3. We assume that the second fundamental form $\langle v, d^2\phi_k(s)\rangle$ of Σ_k at $\phi_k(s)$ is nondegenerate.

Condition (3) always holds if Σ_k is strictly convex, then there exists unique s obtained by maximizing $\langle \phi_k(s), v\rangle$. If Σ_k is not convex there can be several such points s, and then we will have several edges γ joining the vertices κ, κ'.

Thus we defined the graph with the set of vertices $J = \{\kappa\}$ and the set of edges $E = \{\gamma\}$. The Lagrangian L_κ has the anti-integrable form with $V^+_\kappa = \langle v^+_\kappa, \phi_j\rangle$ and $V^-_\kappa = -\langle v^-_\kappa, \phi_i\rangle$. Any path in the graph defines a code. Now Theorem 4.1 implies:

Theorem 5.1 *(compare with [30]). Suppose that ε is sufficiently small. Then for any code* $\mathbf{k}$ *there is a billiard trajectory* $\mathbf{x}$ *in Ω_ε shadowing the chain of quasitrajectories* $\mathbf{k} = (\kappa_i)$. *The orbit* $\mathbf{x}$ *is hyperbolic.*

The billiard system in Ω_ε is the ambient system for the DLS we have constructed. Lower estimates for topological entropy of the ambient system can be obtained with the help of the topological Markov chain we obtain. A more detailed study of the problem of topological entropy for a billiard with small scatterers is presented in [31].

Note that if the scatterers are convex, then under certain conditions the billiard will be hyperbolic, and then much stronger results hold, in particular the metric entropy will be positive [28].

5.4 Birkhoff-Smale-Shilnikov theorem

As a general example of an application of the AI limit in symplectic maps, we prove the existence of a chaotic hyperbolic invariant set for a discrete dynamical system with a transverse homoclinic orbit. This theorem goes back to Birkhoff [13] and Smale [65] and in the final form was proved by Shilnikov [63], see [52, 64].

We will prove the Birkhoff–Smale–Shilnikov theorem for symplectic maps. However, a general (nonsympectic) map can be reduced to a symplectic one by doubling the dimension, see the remark in the end of the section.

Let $F : P \to P$ be a symplectic map of a $2m$-dimensional symplectic manifold and O a hyperbolic fixed point. Suppose that there exist transverse homoclinic orbits to O. Take a finite collection $\{\gamma_k\}_{k\in I}$ of them. We will show that trajectories of F which stay in a neighborhood of the homoclinic set $\cup_{k\in I}\gamma_k \cup O$ are described by an anti-integrable DLS. This provides a symbolic representation of the trajectories in vicinity of the homoclinic set.

It is convenient to denote by W^+ and W^- the stable and unstable manifolds[6] of O:

$$W^{\pm} = \{x : F^n(x) \to O \text{ as } n \to \pm\infty\}.$$

There exist symplectic coordinates q, p in a neighborhood D of O such that $O = (0,0)$ and the local stable and unstable manifolds $W^{\pm}_{loc} \subset D$ are Lagrangian graphs over a ball $U \subset \mathbb{R}^m$:

$$W^+_{loc} = \{(q,p) : q \in U,\ p = -\nabla S_+(q)\}, \quad W^-_{loc} = \{(q,p) : q \in U,\ p = \nabla S_-(q)\}. \tag{5.4}$$

Let

$$\lambda_j, \lambda_j^{-1}, \qquad 0 < |\lambda_j| < 1, \quad j = 1, \dots, m,$$

be the eigenvalues of $DF(O)$. Fix

$$\alpha \in (\max\{|\lambda_j|\}, 1).$$

The local dynamics near O is described by the next statement which can be deduced from the Shilnikov lemma [63] or strong the λ-lemma [39].

Lemma 5.1 *Let N be sufficiently large. Then for any $n \geq N$ and $q^{\pm} \in U$ there exist $p^{\pm}$ such that $F^n(q^+, p^+) = (q^-, p^-)$ and $F^i(q^+, p^+) \in D$ for $0 \leq i \leq n$. The*

[6] The standard notation is W^s and W^u.

map $(q^+,p^+)\mapsto(q^-,p^-)$ *is a symplectic diffeomorphism* $F^n: D_n^+\to D_n^-$ *of open sets in D given by the generating function (defined up to a constant)*

$$S_n(q^+,q^-)=S_+(q^+)+S_-(q^-)+u_n(q^+,q^-), \tag{5.5}$$

where $\|u_n\|_{C^2(U\times U)}\le C\alpha^n$.

Thus

$$F^n(q^+,p^+)=(q^-,p^-) \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad p^+\,dq^+-p^-\,dq^-=dS_n(q^+,q^-).$$

For large n the generating function S_n of the local map $F^n: D_n^+\to D_n^-$ has an anti-integrable form. To obtain chaotic dynamics we need to come back to O by using a global return map along homoclinic orbits.

Let γ_k be a transverse homoclinic orbit to the fixed point O. Then there are points $z_k^\pm=(q_k^\pm,p_k^\pm)\in\gamma_k\cap W_{loc}^\pm$ and integers m_k such that $F^{m_k}(z_k^-)=z_k^+$. The map F^{m_k} from a neighborhood G_k^- of z_k^- to a neighborhood G_k^+ of z_k^+ is called the global map. Since the map is symplectic, there exist functions Φ_k such that

$$F^{m_k}(q^-,p^-)=(q^+,p^+) \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad p^+\,dq^+-p^-\,dq^-=d\Phi_k. \tag{5.6}$$

Perturbing the coordinates if needed, we can assume $\det(\partial q^+/\partial p^-)\neq 0$. Then we can locally express Φ_k as a function $\Phi_k(q^-,q^+)$ on $U_k^-\times U_k^+$, where $U_k^\pm\subset U$ is a neighborhood of $q_k^\pm$. Then Φ_k is the generating function of the global map $F^{m_k}: G_k^-\to G_k^+$.

Equations (5.4) and (5.6) imply that the function

$$R_k(q^-,q^+)=S_-(q^-)+\Phi_k(q^-,q^+)+S_+(q^+)$$

has a critical point (q_k^-,q_k^+) which corresponds to the homoclinic orbit γ_k. Since γ_k is transverse, the critical point is nondegenerate.

Trajectories of F which stay in a neighborhood of the homoclinic set correspond to trajectories of the DLS with Lagrangians $\{\Phi_k,S_n\}_{k\in I,n\ge N}$. However, formally this system is not anti-integrable. Application of Theorem 4.1 is cleaner if we consider another DLS with $2m$ degrees of freedom.

Let $J=\{\kappa=(k,n): k\in I,\ n\ge N\}$. We define the DLS $\{L_\kappa\}_{\kappa\in J}$ with the discrete Lagrangian L_κ representing the composition $F^n\circ F^{m_k}$ of the global and local map. Set

$$L_\kappa(x,y)=\Phi_k(x)+S_n(x^+,y^-), \qquad x=(x^-,x^+)\in U_k^-\times U_k^+,\quad y=(y^-,y^+)\in U^2.$$

Remark 5.1 *The Lagrangian L_κ has $2m$ degrees of freedom. We can replace it by the reduced Lagrangian*

$$\tilde{L}_\kappa(x^-,y^-) = \mathrm{Crit}_{x^+}(\Phi_k(x^-,x^+)) + S_n(x^+,y^-))$$

with m degrees of freedom. This requires an extra nondegeneracy condition which can be satisfied by perturbing the coordinates.

Orbits of F shadowing the homoclinic chain (γ_{k_i}) correspond to critical points of the action functional

$$A_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum L_{\kappa_i}(x_i, x_{i+1}), \qquad x_i = (x_i^-, x_i^+) \in U_{k_i}^- \times U_{k_i}^+, \quad \kappa_i = (k_i, n_i).$$

To obtain an anti-integrable DLS, we replace L_κ with a gauge equivalent Lagrangian (with the same action functional)

$$\hat{L}_\kappa(x,y) = L_\kappa(x,y) + S_-(x^-) - S_-(y^-) = R_k(x) + O(\alpha^n),$$

where R_k has a nondegenerate critical point (q_k^-, q_k^+). In the notation of Theorem 4.1 we have an anti-integrable DLS defined by a graph Γ with the set of vertices J, and any two vertices are joined by an edge. If there is no restriction on n_i from above, then the graph will be infinite, but it is easy to see that Theorem 4.2 works. We obtain the Birkhof-Smale-Shilnikov theorem:

Theorem 5.2 *For any code $\kappa_i = (k_i, n_i) \in J$ the corresponding homoclinic chain (γ_{k_i}) is shadowed by a unique hyperbolic trajectory of F which follows γ_{k_i}, then stays for n_i iterations in a neighborhood of O, then shadows $\gamma_{k_{i+1}}$ and so on. Thus F has a chaotic hyperbolic invariant set.*

The standard graph which gives symbolic representation of dynamics in a neighborhood of a transverse homoclinic orbit is a bit different [52]: there is one vertex for every homoclinic orbit γ_k and one more for the fixed point O. After γ_{k_i}, a path in the graph may stay at O for several steps n_i before following $\gamma_{k_{i+1}}$. Thus a path corresponds to a sequence (k_i, n_i) as described above, so dynamics is equivalent.

Remark 5.2 *The Birkhof-Smale-Shilnikov theorem holds for a general (nonsymplectic) map f. Indeed, the map $q^+ = f(q^-)$ can be reduced to a symplectic map F with the generating function $S(q^-, p^+) = \langle f(q^-), p^+ \rangle$ by introducing the conjugate momentum:*

$$p^- = \partial_{q^-} S, \quad q^+ = \partial_{p^+} S = f(q^-).$$

If f has a hyperbolic fixed point possessing a transverse homoclinic orbits, then so does F. Thus we proved Theorem 5.2 also for nonsymplectic maps.

5.5 Shadowing a chain of invariant tori

The following application of the AI limit is based on [15]. Let $F : P \to P$ be a smooth symplectic diffeomorphism which has a d-dimensional hyperbolic invariant torus Γ. Then Γ is the image of a smooth embedding $h : \mathbb{T}^d \to P$, and $F|_\Gamma$ is a translation with the rotation vector $\rho \in \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$F(h(x)) = F(x+\rho).$$

If the rotation vector is Diophantine:

$$|\langle \rho, j\rangle - j_0| \geq \alpha |j|^{-\beta}, \qquad \alpha, \beta > 0,$$

for any $j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$ and $j_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$, the torus is said to be *Diophantine.* We assume the torus to be *isotropic*, i.e. $\omega|_\Gamma = 0$. If the torus is Diophantine and the symplectic structure exact, this is always so.

Definition 5.1 *The torus Γ is called hyperbolic if there exist two smooth $(m-d)$-dimensional subbundles $E^\pm$ of the bundle $T_\Gamma P$ such that*

- *$E^\pm$ are invariant for the linearized map DF, i.e. $DF(x)E^\pm_x = E^\pm_{F(x)}$ for all $x \in \Gamma$.*
- *The linearized map is contracting on E^+ and expanding on E^-, i.e. for some $c > 0, \lambda > 1$ and all $x \in \Gamma$,*

$$\|DF^k(x)\big|_{E^+_x}\| \leq c\lambda^{-k}, \quad \|DF^{-k}(x)\big|_{E^-_x}\| \leq c\lambda^{-k}, \qquad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We fixed some Riemannian metric, and $\|\cdot\|$ is the operator norm defined by this metric. Since Γ is compact, the definition is independent of the metric.

Definition 5.2 *A torus Γ is nondegenerate if all bounded trajectories of the linearized map are tangent to Γ. Thus if $x \in \Gamma$, $v \in T_xM$, and $\|DF^k(x)v\| \leq c$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $v \in T_x\Gamma$.*

We can rewrite the definition of a hyperbolic torus in the coordinate form.

Definition 5.3 *An invariant torus Γ is called hyperbolic if in its tubular neighborhood D there exist symplectic coordinates $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $z_\pm \in \mathbb{R}^{m-d}$ such that:*

- $\omega|_D = dy \wedge dx + dz_+ \wedge dz_-$;
- Γ *is given by the equations* $y = 0, z_- = z_+ = 0$.
- *The map* $F|_D$ *has the form*

$$\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \\ z_- \\ z_+ \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} x + \rho + Ay \\ y \\ B^*(x)^{-1} z_- \\ B(x) z_+ \end{pmatrix} + O_2(y, z_-, z_+). \tag{5.7}$$

- *The Lyapunov exponents for the skew product map* $(x,z) \mapsto (x+\rho, B(x)z)$ *are negative: there exists a norm such that* $\|B(x)\| \leq \alpha < 1$.
- *The symmetric* $d \times d$ *matrix* A *is constant.*

For a Diophantine torus Definitions 5.1 and 5.3 are equivalent, see [25]. If we use Definition 5.3, then for the sequel it is not necessary to assume that the torus is Diophantine. However, hyperbolic invariant tori arising in applications are usually Diophantine. A hyperbolic torus is nondegenerate iff $\det A \neq 0$. By KAM-theory, hyperbolic nondegenerate Diophantine invariant tori survive small smooth exact symplectic perturbations of the map.

The hyperbolic torus Γ has m-dimensional stable W^+ and unstable W^- manifolds consisting of trajectories $F^n(z)$ that are asymptotic to Γ as $n \to +\infty$ and $n \to -\infty$ respectively.

Let $\{\Gamma_k\}_{k \in I}$ be a finite set of nondegenerate hyperbolic tori of dimension $0 < d_k < m$, and let $W_k^{\pm}$ be their stable and unstable manifolds. A point $z \in W_j^- \cap W_k^+$ is called a heteroclinic point, and its orbit $\gamma = (F^n(z))_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is called a heteroclinic orbit connecting Γ_j with Γ_k. It is called transverse if $T_z W_j^- \cap T_z W_k^+ = \{0\}$.

Let $\{\gamma_\kappa\}_{\kappa \in J}$ be a finite set of transverse heteroclinic[7] orbits connecting pairs of tori from the set $\{\Gamma_k\}_{k \in I}$. Let G be the oriented graph with vertices $k \in I$ and edges $\kappa \in J$ corresponding to heteroclinic orbits.

Theorem 5.3 *Let* $N > 0$ *be sufficiently large. Take any sequence of integers* $(n_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$, $n_i \geq N$. *Let* $\kappa = (\kappa_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ *be a path on the graph* G *corresponding to the sequence* $(\gamma_{\kappa_i})_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ *of heteroclinics connecting* $\Gamma_{k_{i-1}}$ *with* Γ_{k_i}. *Then there exists a (nonunique) trajectory of* F *shadowing the heteroclinic chain* $(\gamma_{\kappa_i})_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ *and staying for* n_i *iterations in a neighborhood of the torus* Γ_{k_i} *after shadowing* γ_{κ_i}.

[7] In the sequel heteroclinic always means that homoclinic are included.

Such results can be proved by Easton's window method [46], but the AI limit proof seems simpler and more constructive. An alternative to AI limit approach is given by variational methods which do not require transverality of heteroclinics (see e.g. [49, 11, 32, 33, 50]), but these methods are limited to positive definite Lagrangian systems.

Theorem 5.3 is analogous to the shadowing lemma in the general theory of hyperbolic sets of dynamical systems [52]. The difference is that the set $\bigcup_{k\in I}\Gamma_k \cup \bigcup_{\kappa\in J}\gamma_\kappa$ is not hyperbolic, so the standard results of the hyperbolic theory do not apply. Theorem 5.3 can be used to construct diffusion orbits in the problem of Arnold diffusion for an ε-small perturbation of an priori unstable system (see section 7.2). However, this is possible only away from strong resonances and moreover the diffusion speed given by Theorem 5.3 will be of order $O(\varepsilon^2)$ which is much weaker than the diffusion speed $O(\varepsilon/|\log\varepsilon|)$ obtained by using the AI limit approach for the separatrix map, see section 7.2.

When the hyperbolic tori are hyperbolic fixed points, we obtain a weaker version of Theorem 5.2. In general the proof is similar. We will replace Lemma 5.1 with the following Lemma 5.2.

Let Γ be a hyperbolic torus. Choose symplectic coordinates (q,p) in a small tubular neighborhood D of Γ so that the Lagrangian local stable and unstable manifolds are given by generating functions:

$$W^+_{loc} = \{(q,p)\in D : q\in U,\ p = -\nabla S^+(q)\},\quad W^-_{loc} = \{(q,p)\in D : q\in U,\ p = \nabla S^-(q)\}.$$

The projection of $\Gamma = W^+_{loc}\cap W^-_{loc}$ to U is the torus $T = \{q : \nabla(S^+ + S^-)(q) = 0\}$.

Since U is a tubular neighborhood of the torus T, we have a (noncanonical) projection $U \to \mathbb{T}^d$. Let $\widetilde{U}$ be the universal coverings of U. Then we have a map $\phi : \widetilde{U} \to \mathbb{R}^d$. The map F is lifted to a map $F : \widetilde{D} \to \widetilde{D}$.

Lemma 5.2 *Let $r > 0$. There exists $N > 0$ such that:*

- *For all $n \ge N$ and all (q_+, q_-) in the set*

$$Y^n = \{(q_+,q_-)\in \widetilde{U}\times\widetilde{U} : |\phi(q_-) - \phi(q_+) - n\rho| \le r\} \tag{5.8}$$

  there exist unique $z_+ = (q_+,p_+)\in\widetilde{D}$ and $z_- = (q_-,p_-)\in\widetilde{D}$ such that $F^n(z_+) = z_-$ and $F^j(z_+)\in\widetilde{D}$ for $j = 0,1,\dots,n$.

- *The map $F^n : (q_+,p_+)\to(q_-,p_-)$ is given by the generating function Q^n:*

$$F^n(q_+,p_+) = (q_-,p_-) \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad p_- = \partial_{q_-}Q^n(q_+,q_-),\quad p_+ = -\partial_{q_+}Q^n(q_+,q_-).$$

- *Q^n is a smooth function on Y^n and has the form*

$$Q^n(q_+,q_-) = S^+(q_+) + S^-(q_-) + n^{-1}v_n(q_+,q_-), \tag{5.9}$$

where $\|v_n\|_{C^2(Y^n)} \le Cr^2$. The constant $C > 0$ is independent of n.

We do not need the rotation vector ρ to be Diophantine or nonresonant, but it is essential that A is nondegenerate. Lemma 5.2 is proved in [15] for $d = m-1$. For any $0 < d < m$ the proof is similar. For $d = 0$, Lemma 5.1 gives a stronger estimate.

For every torus $\{\Gamma_k\}_{k\in I}$ we define the tubular neighborhoods U_k and D_k and generating functions $S_k^\pm$ and Q_k^n as above. Lemma 5.2 provides the discrete Lagrangian describing the local map near the hyperbolic tori Γ_k. Next we define the discrete Lagrangian describing the global map along a transverse heteroclinic γ_κ.

Take two tori Γ_j, Γ_k joined by a heteroclinic (homoclinic if $k = j$) orbit $\gamma_\kappa \subset W_j^- \cap W_k^+$. There exist points

$$z_\kappa^- = (q_\kappa^-, p_\kappa^-) \in \gamma_\kappa \cap D_j, \quad z_\kappa^+ = (q_\kappa^+, p_\kappa^+) \in \gamma_\kappa \cap D_k$$

and $m_\kappa \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $F^{m_\kappa}(z_\kappa^-) = z_\kappa^+$.

The symplectic coordinates can be chosen in such a way that the global map F^{m_κ} from a neighborhood of z_κ^- to a neighborhood of z_κ^+ is given by a generating function Φ_κ on $X_\kappa^- \times X_\kappa^+$, where $X_\kappa^\pm$ is a small neighborhood of $q_\kappa^\pm$:

$$F^{m_\kappa}(q_-,p_-) = (q_+,p_+) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad p_+ = \partial_{q_+}\Phi_\kappa(q_-,q_+), \quad p_- = -\partial_{q_-}\Phi_\kappa(q_-,q_+). \tag{5.10}$$

Since the heteroclinic γ_κ is transverse, exactly as in the previous section we conclude that (q_κ^-, q_κ^+) is a nondegenerate critical point of the function

$$R_\kappa(q_-,q_+) = S_j^-(q_-) + \Phi_\kappa(q_-,q_+) + S_k^+(q_+), \qquad (q_-,q_+) \in X_\kappa^- \times X_\kappa^+.$$

Let $\pi : \widetilde{U}_k \to U_k$ be the universal covering with the transformation group

$$\tau_\nu : \widetilde{U}_k \to \widetilde{U}_k, \qquad \nu \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_k}, \quad d_k = \dim\Gamma_k.$$

Fix connected components $Z_\kappa^\pm$ of $\widetilde{X}_\kappa^\pm = \pi^{-1}(X_\kappa^\pm)$. Then $\widetilde{X}_\kappa^\pm = \cup_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}^{d_k}} \tau_\nu Z_\kappa^\pm$. To decrease the nonuniqueness, we assume that $Z_\kappa^\pm$ intersect with the same fundamental domain K of the group action. Then

$$\max\{d(x,y) : x \in Y_\kappa^+, y \in Y_\kappa^-\} \le 2\,\mathrm{diam}\,K. \tag{5.11}$$

Let $\rho_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d_k}$ be the rotation vector of the torus Γ_k. Take $R > \sqrt{d_k}$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $v \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_k}$ such that

$$|v - n\rho_k| \le R.$$

Then

$$|\phi(y) - \phi(x) - n\rho_k| \le r = R + 2\operatorname{diam} K$$

for all $x \in Z_\kappa^+$ and $y \in \tau_v Z_\kappa^-$. Let $N > 0$ be sufficiently large and $n \ge N$. Then

$$Z_\kappa^+ \times \tau_v Z_\kappa^- \subset Y_k^n,$$

where Y_k^n is the set (5.8) corresponding to the torus Γ_k.

Let $\sigma = (\kappa, n, v)$, where $n \ge N$ and v is chosen as above. We define the discrete Lagrangian L_σ by

$$L_\sigma(x,y) = \Phi_\kappa(x) + Q_k^n(x_+, \tau_v y_-), \qquad x = (x_-, x_+), \quad y = (y_-, y_+),$$

where Q_k^n is the function (5.10) corresponding to the torus Γ_k. The Lagrangian L_σ represents trajectories which shadow the heteroclinic orbit γ_κ and then travel in a neighborhood of Γ_k for n iteration of the map F. As in the previous section, L_σ has $2m$ degrees of freedom, but, if desired, we can replace it by a Lagrangian with m degrees of freedom.

To obtain an anti-integrable Lagrangian, we make a gauge transformation:

$$\hat{L}_\sigma(x,y) = L_\sigma(x,y) + S_j^-(x_-) - S_k^-(y_-).$$

By (5.9), $\hat{L}_\sigma = R_\kappa(x) + O(n^{-1})$, and R_κ has a nondegenerate critical point (q_κ^-, q_κ^+).

Suppose we are given a chain of heteroclinics $(\gamma_{\kappa_i})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$, where γ_{κ_i} joins $\gamma_{k_{i-1}}$ and γ_{k_i}. Consider the infinite product

$$Z = \prod_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} Z_{\kappa_i}^- \times Z_{\kappa_i}^+$$

which is the set of sequences

$$\mathbf{x} = (x_i), \qquad x_i = (x_i^-, x_i^+) \in Z_{\kappa_i}^- \times Z_{\kappa_i}^+.$$

For a sequence (n_i, v_i) such that $n_i \ge N$ and $|v_i - n_i\rho_{k_i}| \le R$, set $\sigma_i = (\kappa_i, n_i, v_i)$ and define on Z a formal functional

$$A_\sigma(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} L_{\sigma_i}(x_i, x_{i+1}) = \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \hat{L}_{\sigma_i}(x_i, x_{i+1}).$$

Its critical points correspond to shadowing orbits. Since $\hat{L}_\sigma$ is anti-integrable, Theorem 5.3 follows from Theorem 4.1. ∎

6 AI limit in continuous Lagrangian systems

In the previous sections we gave examples of application of AI limit in DLS. Now we discuss applications of AIL to continuous Lagrangian systems, two examples for autonomous systems and one for time dependent.

6.1 Turaev–Shilnikov theorem for Hamiltonian systems

As an example of the anti-integrable limit in autonomous Lagrangian or Hamiltonian systems, we prove the Turayev–Shilnikov theorem [72] for a Hamiltonian system with a hyperbolic equilibrium. This situation is more delicate than for hyperbolic fixed points of a symplectic map: system with transverse homoclinics may be integrable [40]. The proof we give follows the approach in [24].

Consider a Hamiltonian system with Hamiltonian H on a symplectic manifold P. Let ϕ^t be the flow and O a hyperbolic equilibrium point. We may assume that $H(O) = 0$. Let

$$\pm\lambda_j, \qquad 0 < \operatorname{Re}\lambda_1 \le \cdots \le \operatorname{Re}\lambda_m,$$

be the eigenvalues. Suppose that the eigenvalue λ_1 with the smallest real part is real and

$$0 < \lambda_1 < \operatorname{Re}\lambda_2.$$

The case of complex λ_1 is somewhat simpler, it is studied in [56] and [27].

Let v_+ be an eigenvector corresponding to $-\lambda_1$ and v_- an eigenvector corresponding to λ_1. We fix a metric and assume $|v_\pm| = 1$. To decrease nonuniqueness of the eigenvectors we may assume that $\omega(v_-, v_+) > 0$, where ω is the symplectic 2-form. Then the eigenvectors $v_\pm$ are uniquely defined up to the change $(v_+, v_-) \mapsto (-v_+, -v_-)$.

Let $W^\pm$ be the stable and unstable manifolds of the equilibrium O. They contain strong stable and unstable manifolds $W^{++} \subset W^+$ and $W^{--} \subset W^-$ corresponding to the eigenvalues $\pm\lambda_j$ with $j > 1$. Any trajectory in $W^+ \setminus W^{++}$ is tangent to v_+ as $t \to +\infty$, and any trajectory in $W^- \setminus W^{--}$ is tangent to v_- as $t \to -\infty$.

Let $\gamma(t) = \phi^t(z)$ be a homoclinic trajectory: $\lim_{t\to\pm\infty}\gamma(t) = O$. It is called transverse if $T_{\gamma(0)}W^+ \cap T_{\gamma(0)}W^- = \mathbb{R}\dot\gamma(0)$. Then intersection of W^+ and W^- along γ is transverse in the energy level $H = 0$.

Suppose that there exist several transverse homoclinic orbits $\{\gamma_\kappa\}_{\kappa\in J}$ which do not belong to the strong stable and unstable manifolds. Then γ_κ will be tangent

to $v_\pm$ as $t \to \pm\infty$ respectively:

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{\dot\gamma_\kappa(t)}{|\dot\gamma_\kappa(t)|} = s^\pm_\kappa v_\pm, \qquad s^\pm_\kappa = + \text{ or } -.$$

Let us define a graph Γ_- as follows. The vertices $\kappa \in J$ correspond to transverse homoclinics γ_κ. We join the vertices κ and κ' by an edge if $s^+_\kappa = s^-_{\kappa'}$. The graph Γ_+ is defined in the same way but we join κ, κ' by an edge if $s^+_\kappa = -s^-_{\kappa'}$.

Theorem 6.1 *There exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and any path $\mathbf{k} = (\kappa_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ in the graph Γ_+ there exists a hyperbolic trajectory with energy $H = \varepsilon$ shadowing the homoclinic chain (γ_{κ_i}). Similarly, for any path $\mathbf{k} = (\kappa_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ in the graph Γ_- the chain (γ_{κ_i}) is shadowed by a hyperbolic trajectory with energy $H = -\varepsilon$.*

To prove this result we construct an anti-integrable DLS which describes shadowing trajectories. Then it remains to use Theorem 4.1.

There exist symplectic coordinates q, p in a neighborhood D of O such that $O = (0,0)$ and the local stable and unstable manifolds $W^\pm_{loc}$ are Lagrangian graphs over a small ball U in $\mathbb{R}^m$:

$$W^+_{loc} = \{(q,p) : q \in U,\ p = -\nabla S_+(q)\}, \quad W^-_{loc} = \{(q,p) : q \in U,\ p = \nabla S_-(q)\}. \tag{6.1}$$

Set $S_\pm(0) = 0$. We may assume that the coordinates are chosen in such a way that the strong local stable and unstable manifolds are given by

$$W^{++}_{loc} = \{(q,p) \in W^+_{loc} : q_1 = 0\}, \quad W^{--}_{loc} = \{(q,p) \in W^-_{loc} : q_1 = 0\}.$$

Fix small $\delta > 0$ and for $s = +$ or $s = -$ set

$$U_s = \{q \in U : sq_1 > \delta|q|\}, \qquad W^\pm_s = \{(q,p) \in W^\pm_{loc} : q \in U_s\}.$$

We choose the signs in such a way that $v_\pm$ points towards $W^\pm_+$. Then the homoclinic orbit γ_κ satisfies $\gamma_\kappa(t) \in W^\pm_{s^\pm_\kappa}$ for $t \to \pm\infty$.

Take any $\alpha \in (0,1)$.

Lemma 6.1 *Let $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ be sufficiently small and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$. Let $s = +$ or $s = -$. For any $q_\pm \in U_s$ there exist $p_\pm$ and $\tau > 0$ such that $H(q_\pm, p_\pm) = -\varepsilon$ and*



Figure 5: Homoclinics γ_κ and $\gamma_{\kappa'}$ with $s_\kappa^- = s_\kappa^+ = s_{k'}^- = +1$ and $s_{\kappa'}^+ = -1$.

$\phi^\tau(q_+, p_+) = (q_-, p_-)$. *The trajectory* $\gamma(t) = \phi^t(q_+, p_+)$, $0 \le t \le \tau$, *stays in* D *for* $0 \le t \le \tau$. *The Maupertuis action of the trajectory* γ *has the form*

$$S(q_+, q_-, \varepsilon) = \int_\gamma p\, dq = S_+(q_+) + S_-(q_-) + w(q_+, q_-, \varepsilon),$$

where $\|w\|_{C^2} \le C\varepsilon^\alpha$. *If* $q_+ \in U_s$ *and* $q_- \in U_{-s}$, *then the same is true but the trajectory will have energy* $H = \varepsilon$.

Hence for small $\varepsilon > 0$ the local flow near O is described by an anti-integrable discrete Lagrangian. Lemma 6.1 is proved in [24].

Proof of Theorem 6.1. For definiteness we will consider shadowing trajectories with small negative energy $H = -\varepsilon$.

Let $\Sigma = \partial U$. The homoclinic orbit γ_κ exits W_{loc}^- at the point (q_κ^+, p_κ^+) and enters W_{loc}^+ at the point (q_κ^+, p_κ^+), where $q_\kappa^\pm \in \Sigma$. Then there are time moments t_κ such that $\phi^{t_\kappa}(q_\kappa^-, p_\kappa^-) = (q_\kappa^+, p_\kappa^+)$. We can assume that $\det(\partial q_+ / \partial p_-) \ne 0$. Then there are neighborhoods $X_\kappa^\pm$ of $q_\kappa^\pm$ in Σ such that for $(q_-, q_+) \in X_\kappa^- \times X_\kappa^+$ and any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ there exist $p_\pm$ such that $H(q_\pm, p_\pm) = -\varepsilon$ and a trajectory $\phi^t(q_-, p_-)$, $0 \le t \le \tau = t_\kappa + O(\varepsilon)$, with energy $-\varepsilon$ such that $\phi^\tau(q_-, p_-) = (q_+, p_+)$. The map $(q_-, p_-) \mapsto (q_+, p_+)$ has a generating function $\Phi_\kappa(q_-, q_+, \varepsilon)$ such that $d\Phi_\kappa = p_+\, dq_+ - p_-\, dq_-$.

For $\varepsilon = 0$, (6.1) implies that the function

$$R_\kappa(q_-, q_+) = S_-(q_-) + \Phi_\kappa(q_-, q_+, 0) + S_+(q_+), \qquad (q_-, q_+) \in X_\kappa^- \times X_\kappa^+,$$

has a critical point (q_κ^-, q_κ^+) corresponding to the homoclinic orbit γ_κ. Since γ_κ is transverse, the critical point is nondegenerate.

For small $\varepsilon > 0$, trajectories with $H = -\varepsilon$ shadowing heteroclinic orbits $\{\gamma_\kappa\}$ correspond to trajectories of a DLS $\{\Phi_\kappa, S\}$ with Lagrangians Φ_κ and S defined on open sets in Σ. It has $m-1$ degrees of freedom. To apply Theorem 4.1 it is convenient to introduce a DLS with $2m-2$ degrees of freedom.

We may assume that $X^\pm_\kappa \subset U_{s^\pm_\kappa}$. Define the discrete Lagrangian L_κ on $X^-_\kappa \times X^+_\kappa \times (U_{s^+_\kappa} \cap \Sigma)$ by

$$L_\kappa(x,y,\varepsilon) = \Phi_\kappa(x,\varepsilon) + S(x_+, y_-, \varepsilon), \qquad x = (x_-, x_+),\ y = (y_-.y_+).$$

This Lagrangian has $2m-2$ degrees of freedom.

For a given path $\mathbf{k} = (\kappa_i)$ in the graph Γ_-, we obtain the discrete action functional

$$A_\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum L_{\kappa_i}(x_i, x_{i+1}, \varepsilon), \qquad x_i = (x_i^-, x_i^+).$$

As explained in section 3.4, trajectories with $H = -\varepsilon$ shadowing the homoclinic chain (γ_{κ_i}) correspond to critical points of $A_\mathbf{k}$, i.e. trajectories of the DLS $\mathscr{L} = \{L_\kappa\}_{\kappa \in J}$.

By a gauge transformation, we can replace L_κ with an anti-integrable Lagrangian

$$\hat{L}_\kappa(x,y,\varepsilon) = L_\kappa(x,y) + S_-(x_-) - S_-(y_-) = R_\kappa(x) + O(\varepsilon^\alpha),$$

where the function R_κ has a nondegenerate critical point (q^-_κ, q^+_κ). Now Theorem 6.1 follows from Theorem 4.1. ∎

Theorem 6.1 was formulated in [72] (in a different form), and proved in [24] (for positive definite Lagrangian systems) and in [71]. In [24] variational methods were used, so transversality of the homoclinics wasn't assumed. Similar results hold for systems with several hyperbolic equilibria on the same energy level.

Consider for example a Lagrangian system on a compact manifold M with $L(q,\dot{q}) = \frac{1}{2}\|\dot{q}\|^2 - V(q)$, where V attains its maximum on the set $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ and each maximum point is nondegenerate. There exist many minimal heteroclinics joining the points in A, for example any pair of points can be joined by a chain of heteroclinics. Suppose that minimal heteroclinics γ_κ do not belong to the strong stable or unstable manifolds, and define the numbers $s^\pm_\kappa$ as above. Define the graph Γ_- by joining κ and κ' by an edge if $s^+_\kappa = s^-_{\kappa'}$. Then for small $\varepsilon > 0$ and any path in the graph Γ_- there exists a trajectory with energy $-\varepsilon$ shadowing the corresponding chain of heteroclinics. See [8] for interesting concrete examples.

6.2 n-center problem with small masses

The problem we consider in this section is somewhat similar to the one discussed in Section 5.3: instead of small scatterers we have small singularities of the potential.

Let M be a smooth manifold and $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ a finite set in M. Consider a Lagrangian system with the configuration space $M \setminus A$ and the Lagrangian

$$L(q, \dot{q}, \varepsilon) = L_0(q, \dot{q}) - \varepsilon V(q). \tag{6.2}$$

We assume that L_0 is smooth on TM and quadratic in the velocity:

$$L_0(q, \dot{q}) = \frac{1}{2}\|\dot{q}\|^2 + \langle w(q), \dot{q}\rangle - W(q), \tag{6.3}$$

where $\| \ \|$ is a Riemannian metric on M.

The potential V is a smooth function on $M \setminus A$ with Newtonian singularities: in a small ball U_k around a_k,

$$V(q) = -\frac{\phi_k(q)}{\operatorname{dist}(q, a_k)}, \tag{6.4}$$

where ϕ_k is a smooth positive function on U_k. The distance is defined by means of the Riemannian metric $\| \ \|$. We call the system with the Lagrangian (6.2) the n-center problem. For $\varepsilon = 0$ the limit system with the Lagrangian (6.3) has no singularities.

Let

$$H(q, \dot{q}, \varepsilon) = H_0 + \varepsilon V, \qquad H_0(q, \dot{q}) = \frac{1}{2}\|\dot{q}\|^2 + W(q) \tag{6.5}$$

be the energy integral. We fix E such that $D = \{W < E\}$ contains the set A and study the system on the energy level $\{H = E\}$.

We call a trajectory $\gamma : [a, b] \to D$ of the limit system with the Lagrangian (6.3) a nondegenerate collision orbit if $\gamma(a), \gamma(b) \in A$, $\gamma(t) \notin A$ for $a < t < b$, and the endpoints are nonconjugate along γ on the energy level $H = E$, i.e. for the Maupertis action functional.

Suppose there are several nondegenerate collision orbits $\{\gamma_\kappa\}_{\kappa \in J}$ connecting points $a_\kappa^-, a_\kappa^+ \in A$. We denote by v_κ^- and v_κ^+ the initial and final velocity of γ_κ. Consider a graph Γ with vertices J. We join κ, κ' by an edge if $a_\kappa^+ = a_{\kappa'}^-$ and $v_\kappa^+ \neq \pm v_{\kappa'}^-$.

The next result is proved in [19].

Theorem 6.2 *There exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ and any path $\kappa = (\kappa_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ in the graph Γ there exists a unique (up to a time shift) trajectory of energy E shadowing the chain $(\gamma_{\kappa_i})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ of collision orbits.*

Hence there is an invariant subset in $\{H = E\}$ on which the system is conjugate to a suspension of a topological Markov chain. The topological entropy is positive provided that the graph Γ has a connected branched subgraph.

Conditions of Theorem 6.2 are formulated in terms of the Lagrangian L_0 and the set A only, not involving the potential V provided it has Newtonian singularities at P. We can also add to L a smooth $O(\varepsilon)$-small perturbation.

Corollary 6.1 *Suppose M is a closed manifold and*

$$E > \min_{q\in M} \left(\frac{1}{2}\|w(q)\|^2 + W(q) \right).$$

Then for any $n \geq 2$, almost all points $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in M$, and small $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a chaotic hyperbolic invariant set of trajectories of energy E close to chains of collision orbits.

Indeed, the assumption implies that the Jacobi metric

$$ds_E = \sqrt{2(E - W(q))}\|dq\| + \langle w(q), dq\rangle$$

is a positive definite Finsler metric on M, and by Morse theory any two generic points can be connected by an infinite number of nondegenerate geodesics, i.e. trajectories of energy E. Thus any two points in a generic finite set $A \subset M$ can be connected by an infinite number of nondegenerate collision trajectories of energy E, and any other points in A do not lie on these trajectories.

If n is large enough, then chaotic trajectories exist for purely topological reasons [21], so genericity of A and smallness of ε is not needed.

Remark 6.1 *There is another corollary of Theorem 6.2 for systems with no small parameter:*

$$L(q, \dot{q}) = \frac{1}{2}\|\dot{q}\|^2 - V(q),$$

but with large energy $E = \varepsilon^{-1}$. After a time change $s = \varepsilon^{-1/2}t$ we obtain the Lagrangian (6.2) with $L_0 = \|\dot{q}\|^2/2$. Hence the conclusion of Theorem 6.2 holds. See [53] for the classical n center problem.

Next we prove Theorem 6.2. First consider the limit system with $\varepsilon = 0$. Let $\Sigma_k = \partial U_k$. For any $x \in \Sigma_k$, there is a unique trajectory γ_x^+ of energy E connecting x with a_k in U_k and a unique trajectory γ_x^- of energy E connecting a_k with x. Denote

$$S_k^{\pm}(x) = \int_{\gamma_x^{\pm}} p\,dq = \int_{\gamma_x^{\pm}} ds_E. \tag{6.6}$$

Then $S_k^{\pm}$ are smooth functions on Σ_k.

Denote by $u^+(x)$ and $u^-(x)$ the velocity vectors of $\gamma_x^{\pm}$ at the point a_k. Fix arbitrary small $\delta > 0$ and let

$$X_k = \{(x,y) \in \Sigma_k^2 \mid \|u_+(x) - u_-(y)\| \geq \delta\}. \tag{6.7}$$

Lemma 6.2 *Suppose $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ is sufficiently small and let $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$.*

- *For any $(x,y) \in X_k$, there exists a unique trajectory $\gamma = \gamma_{x,y}^{\varepsilon}$ of energy E connecting x with y in U_k.*
- *γ smoothly depends on x, y.*
- *The Maupertuis action*

$$S_k(x,y,\varepsilon) = \int_{\gamma} p\,dq \tag{6.8}$$

is a smooth function on $X_k \times (0, \varepsilon_0]$ and, modulo a constant $\varepsilon \log \varepsilon$,

$$Q_k(x,y,\varepsilon) = S_k^-(x) + S_k^+(y) + \varepsilon u_k(x,y,\varepsilon),$$

where u_k is uniformly C^2 bounded on X_k as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

The proof is based on regularization of singularities and a version of Lemma 5.1. In fact all positive eigenvalues for the regularized system will be equal, so Lemma 5.1 needs modification, see [19].

For any $\kappa \in J$, let $x_\kappa \in \Sigma_{\kappa^-}$ and $y_\kappa \in \Sigma_{\kappa^+}$ be the intersection points of the collision orbit γ_κ with Σ_{κ^-} and Σ_{κ^+} respectively. If the spheres Σ_k are small enough, the points x_κ and y_κ are nonconjugate along γ_κ.

Let $U_\kappa^- \subset \Sigma_{\kappa^-}$ be a small neighborhood of x_κ, and $U_\kappa^+ \subset \Sigma_{\kappa^+}$ a small neighborhood of y_κ. Taking $\delta > 0$ small enough, it can be assumed that for any edge (κ, κ') we have $U_\kappa^+ \times U_{\kappa'}^- \subset X_k$, where $a_k = a_\kappa^+ = a_{\kappa'}^-$. If the neighborhoods $U_\kappa^{\pm}$ are small enough and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, any points $x \in U_\kappa^-$ and $y \in U_\kappa^+$ are joined by a unique trajectory β_ε of energy $H = E$ which is close to γ_κ. Let

$$\Phi_\kappa(x,y,\varepsilon) = \int_{\beta_\varepsilon} p\,dq$$

be its action. Then Φ_κ is a smooth function on $U_\kappa^- \times U_\kappa^+$.

Lemma 6.3 *The function* $R_\kappa(x,y) = \Phi_\kappa(x,y,0) + S^-_{\kappa^-}(x) + S^+_{\kappa^+}(y)$ *on* $U^-_\kappa \times U^+_\kappa$ *has a nondegenerate critical point* (x_κ, y_κ).

Lemma 6.3 follows from the assumption that γ_κ is a nondegenerate critical point of the action functional. Indeed, $R_k(x,y)$ is the Maupertuis action of the piecewise smooth trajectory of the limit system obtained by gluing together the trajectories γ^-_x, β_0 and γ^+_y. Hence R_k is a restriction of the action functional to a finite-dimensional submanifold consisting of broken trajectories (with break points x,y) connecting a_{κ^-} with a_{κ^+}. ∎

Define the discrete Lagrangian with $2m-2$ degrees of freedom by

$$L_\kappa(z_-, z_+, \varepsilon) = \Phi_\kappa(z_-) + Q_{\kappa^+}(y_-, x_+, \varepsilon), \qquad z_- = (x_-, y_-), \quad z_+ = (x_+, y_+).$$

For any path $\mathbf{k} = (\kappa_i)$ in the graph Γ, critical points of the functional

$$A_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{z}) = \sum L_{\kappa_i}(z_i, z_{i+1}, \varepsilon), \qquad z_i \in U^-_{\kappa_i} \times U^+_{\kappa_i}.$$

correspond to trajectories with energy $H = E$ which shadow the collision chain (γ_{κ_i}).

As in Section 6.1, we replace L_κ by a gauge equivalent anti-integrable Lagrangian

$$\hat{L}_\kappa(z_-, z_+, \varepsilon) = L(z_-, z_+, \varepsilon) + S^-_{\kappa^-}(x_-) - S^-_{\kappa^+}(x_+) = R_\kappa(z_-) + O(\varepsilon).$$

By Lemma 6.3, R_κ has a nondegenerate critical point. Now Theorem 6.2 follows from Theorem 4.1. ∎

For a concrete example, consider the spatial circular restricted 3 body problem (Sun, Jupiter, and Asteroid) and suppose that the mass ε of Jupiter is small with respect to the mass $1-\varepsilon$ of the Sun. The center of mass is stationary and the first two masses move in circular orbits about it, having separation and angular frequency both normalized to 1.

Consider the motion of the Asteroid in the frame *Oxyz* rotating anti-clockwise about the *z*-axis through the Sun at $O = (0,0,0)$. Jupiter can be chosen at $P = (1,0,0)$. The motion of the Asteroid $q = (x,y,z)$ is described by a Lagrangian system of the form (6.2), where

$$L_0(q,\dot{q}) = \tfrac{1}{2}|\dot{q}|^2 + x\dot{y} - y\dot{x} + \tfrac{1}{2}|q|^2 + \tfrac{1}{|q|}, \qquad V(q) = \tfrac{1}{|q|} - \tfrac{1}{|q-P|} + x.$$

We have $M = \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{O\}$ and the singular set consists of one point P. The energy integral in the rotating coordinate frame

$$H = \frac{1}{2}|\dot{q}|^2 - \frac{1}{2}|q|^2 - \frac{1-\varepsilon}{|q|} - \frac{\varepsilon}{|q-p|} + \varepsilon x$$

is called the Jacobi integral, and $C = -2H$ is called the *Jacobi constant*.

For $\varepsilon = 0$, the limit system is the Kepler problem of Sun–Asteroid. Its bounded orbits are transformations to the rotating frame of ellipses with parameters a, e, ι, where a is the semi-major axis, e is the eccentricity, and ι the inclination of the orbit to the plane of the orbit of the Sun and Jupiter. They have angular frequency $\Omega = a^{-3/2}$ and Jacobi constant $C = a^{-1} + 2\sqrt{a(1-e^2)}\cos\iota$. Collision orbits are rotating Kepler arcs starting and ending at P.

Given $C \in (-2, +3)$ we define the set A_C of allowed frequencies of Kepler ellipses to be

- $(0,1)$ if $C \in [-1, +2]$,
- $(0, (2+C)^{3/2})$ if $C \in (-2, -1)$,
- $((3-C)^{3/2}, 1)$ if $C \in (2,3)$.

The next result was proved in [20]

Theorem 6.3 *For any $C \in (-2, +3)$ there exists a subset $S \subset A_C$ such that for any $\Omega \in S$ there is a nondegenerate collision orbit γ_Ω with frequency Ω and inclination $\iota = \arccos C/2 - \Omega^{2/3}$.*

Then Theorem 6.2 implies:

Corollary 6.2 *For any finite set $\Lambda \subset S$ there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any sequence $(\Omega_n)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$ in Λ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ there is a trajectory of the spatial circular restricted 3 body problem with Jacobi constant C which $O(\varepsilon)$-shadows a concatenation of collision orbits formed from Kepler arcs γ_{Ω_n}. The resulting invariant set is uniformly hyperbolic.*

Trajectories of the 3 body problem which shadow chains of collision orbits of the Kepler problem were named by Poincaré second species solutions.

In [17] and [22] similar results were obtained for the elliptic restricted and nonrestricted plane 3 body problem with 2 masses small. The proof is also based on a reduction to a DLS, but the Lagrangian is only partly anti-integrable. The corresponding generalizations of Theorem 4.1 are proved in [16, 23].

6.3 Lagrangian systems with slow time dependence

A straightforward analog of an anti-integrable DLS is a continuous Lagrangian system with slow time dependence:

$$L = L(q, \varepsilon\dot{q}, t, \varepsilon), \qquad q \in M, \tag{6.9}$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is a small parameter. For example

$$L = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\|\dot{q}\|^2 + U(q,t), \tag{6.10}$$

where $\|\ \|$ is a Riemannian metric on M, possibly depending on t. It looks similar to the anti-integrable discrete Lagrangian (5.2). Thus we may expect that the limit $\varepsilon \to 0$ is similar to the anti-integrable limit in DLS.

Introducing the fast time $s = t/\varepsilon$, we obtain a system depending slowly on s:

$$L = L(q, q', t, \varepsilon), \qquad q' = \frac{dq}{ds}. \tag{6.11}$$

If L satisfies the Legendre condition, the Lagrangian system can be represented as a Hamiltonian system:

$$q' = \partial_p H, \quad p' = -\partial_q H, \quad t' = \varepsilon, \tag{6.12}$$

where

$$p = \partial_{q'} L(q, q', t, \varepsilon), \quad H(q, p, t, \varepsilon) = \langle p, q' \rangle - L. \tag{6.13}$$

Denoting $z = (q, p)$, we obtain the differential equation of the form

$$z' = v(z, t, \varepsilon), \quad t' = \varepsilon, \tag{6.14}$$

This is the standard form of a singularly perturbed differential equation [73]. Next we present a simplified version of some results from [18]. References to earlier classical results can be found in this paper. Similar anti-integrable approach methods was used in [61] for the Mather acceleration problem. Interesting results on the chaotic energy growth for systems of type (6.9) were obtained recently in [45] by a very different approach.

For $\varepsilon = 0$ the frozen Lagrangian (6.11) takes the form

$$L_t(q, q') = L(q, q', t, 0), \tag{6.15}$$

where the time t is now frozen. Hence the energy $H_t(q,p) = H(q,p,t,0)$ is a first integral of the frozen system.

Suppose that for each t the frozen system has a hyperbolic equilibrium point O_t, and there exists a homoclinic trajectory $\gamma_t : \mathbb{R} \to M$ with $\gamma_t(\pm\infty) = O_t$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $H_t = 0$ at the equilibrium O_t.

Remark 6.2 *For a natural system (6.10) on a compact manifold the homoclinic trajectory always exists if O_t is a point of strict nondegenerate minimum of $U(q,t)$, see [14]. If M is not simply connected, there are at least as many of them as the number of generators of the semigroup $\pi_1(M)$.*

Let I be the open set of t such that the homoclinic γ_t is transverse: the intersection of the stable and unstable manifolds $W_t^{\pm}$ along γ_t is transversal in the energy level $\{H_t = 0\}$. The Maupertuis action

$$f(t) = J(\gamma_t) = \int_{\gamma_t} p\,dq$$

is a smooth function on I. Hamilton's principle implies that

$$f'(t) = -\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (\partial_t H_t)\,\big|_{\gamma_t(s)}\,ds,$$

where the homoclinic orbit γ_t is parameterized by the fast time s. Hence f is a version of the Poincaré–Melnikov function.

For simplicity assume that L is 1-periodic in time. Take a finite set of nondegenerate critical points of f in $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. The corresponding points in $\mathbb{R}$ form a discrete periodic set $K \subset \mathbb{R}$. If $\rho > 0$ is small enough, then $I_k = (k-\rho, k+\rho)$, $k \in K$, are nonintersecting intervals.

Theorem 6.4 *Fix small $\delta > 0$ and any $0 < c_1 < c_2$. Suppose that $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small. Then for any increasing sequence $k_i \in K$ there exists a unique trajectory $q(t)$ and sequences $t_i \in I_{k_i}$, $c_1 < T_i < c_2$, such that*

- *$d(q(t), \gamma_{k_i}(\mathbb{R}) \le \delta$ for $t \in [t_i, t_i + \varepsilon T_i]$;*
- *$d(q(t), O_t) \le \delta$ for $t \in [t_i + \varepsilon T_i, t_{i+1}]$.*
- *Moreover $|t_i - k_i| \le C\varepsilon$ and $d(q(t), \gamma_{k_i}(\mathbb{R})) \le C\varepsilon$ for $t \in [t_i, t_i + \varepsilon T_i]$.*



Figure 6: Multibump trajectory shadowing the homoclinic γ_k.

We call $q(t)$ a multibump trajectory, see Figure 6. Theorem 6.4 holds also for nonperiodic L if certain uniformity is satisfied.

In [18] a similar result was proved without the transversality assumption. Consider system (6.10) on a non simply connected compact manifold and let $f(t)$ be the minimum of actions of noncontactible homoclinics for the frozen system. Then it is enough to assume that f is nonconstant.

Proof. First let $\varepsilon = 0$. Since O_t is a hyperbolic equilibrium of the limit system, it has local stable and unstable Lagrangian manifolds W_t^+ and W_t^- in the phase space T^*M. We assume for simplicity that the projection $W_t^\pm \to M$ is nondegenerate at O_t. This holds if the limit system is natural as in (6.10); in general we can achieve this by changing symplectic coordinates near O_t. Hence

$$W_t^+ = \{(q,p) : q \in D_t,\ p = -\nabla S_t^+(q)\}, \quad W_t^- = \{(q,p) : q \in D_t,\ p = \nabla S_t^-(q)\},$$

where D_t is a small δ-neighborhood of O_t. Since $S_t^\pm$ is defined up to a function of time, without loss of generality we may assume that $S_t^\pm(O_t) = 0$. Then $-S_t^+(q)$ is the action of the trajectory of the frozen system starting at q and asymptotic to O_t as the fast time $s \to +\infty$, while S_t^- is the action of the trajectory asymptotic to O_t as $s \to -\infty$ and ending at q.

Take small $\varepsilon > 0$. In the next lemma the slow time t is used.

Lemma 6.4 *Fix $0 < c_1 < c_2$. For sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, any $a < b$ such that $b - a \in (c_1, c_2)$ and any $x \in D_a$, $y \in D_b$, there exists a unique trajectory $q(t) \in D_t$, $a \le t \le b$, such that $q(a) = x$ and $q(b) = y$. Moreover:*

- *the function $q(t) = q(t,a,b,x,y,\varepsilon)$ is smooth for $\varepsilon > 0$.*
- *The trajectory $q(t)$ is C^0 close to the concatenation of the asymptotic trajectories of the frozen system.*
- *Let*
$$S(a,b,x,y,\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^{-1} \int_a^b L(q(t), \varepsilon\dot{q}(t), t, \varepsilon)\, dt$$
be the action of the trajectory $q(t)$ normalized to the fast time. Then
$$S = S^+(x) + S^-(y) + \varepsilon v(a,b,x,y,\varepsilon), \tag{6.16}$$
where v is a smooth function for $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\|v\|_{C^2(D_a \times D_b)} \le C$ for some constant C independent of ε.

Note that $q(t)$ behaves badly as $\varepsilon \to 0$: its time derivative is unbounded of order ε^{-1}, while the generating function S is regular as $\varepsilon \to 0$. If the Lagrangian (6.9) is independent of t and ε, then Lemma 6.4 follows from Shilnikov's lemma [63], or the strong λ-lemma [39].

In the general case, the existence of the solution of the given boundary value problem can be obtained from the results of the theory of singularly perturbed differential equations [73].

Let $p(t) = \partial_{q'} L(q(t), \varepsilon\dot{q}(t), t, \varepsilon)$ be the momentum (6.13) of the trajectory $q(t)$. By the first variation formula,

$$\begin{gathered} \partial_x S = -p(a), \quad \partial_y S = p(b), \\ \partial_a S = H(x, p(a), a, \varepsilon), \quad \partial_b S = -H(y, p(b), b, \varepsilon). \end{gathered} \tag{6.17}$$

Lemma 6.4 describes trajectories which stay near the equilibrium O_t during a finite interval of the slow time t. Next we describe trajectories which travel near the homoclinic orbit γ_k in a short interval of slow time of order ε. Hence the fast time $s = \varepsilon^{-1}t$ will be used.

To simplify notation, we can assume that $D_t = D_k$ is independent of t for $t \in I_k$. Let $\Sigma_k = \partial D_k$. Let $\gamma_k(0), \gamma_k(\tau_k)$ be the intersection points of the transverse homoclinic $\gamma_k : \mathbb{R} \to M$ with Σ_k. Changing δ if needed, we may assume that they are nonconjugate along γ_k. Then for $z = (x,y,t,T)$ close to $z_k^0 = (\gamma_k(0), \gamma_k(\tau_k), k, \tau_k)$ and sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a trajectory $\beta_\varepsilon(s)$, $0 \le s \le T$, for system with the Lagrangian $L(q, q', t + \varepsilon s, \varepsilon)$ with boundary conditions $\beta_\varepsilon(0) = x$, $\beta_\varepsilon(T) = y$, which is close to the homoclinic orbit γ_k. Let

$$\Phi_k(z,\varepsilon) = \int_0^T L(\beta_\varepsilon(s), \beta_\varepsilon'(s), t + \varepsilon s, \varepsilon)\, ds$$

be its action. The derivatives of Φ_k satisfy the equations similar to (6.17):

$$\begin{gathered}\partial_x\Phi_k = -p(0), \quad \partial_y F_k = p(T),\\ \partial_t\Phi_k = H(x,p(0),t,\varepsilon), \quad \partial_T\Phi_k = -H(y,p(T),t+\varepsilon T,\varepsilon),\end{gathered} \tag{6.18}$$

where $p(s)$ is the momentum of $\beta_\varepsilon(s)$.

Lemma 6.5 *The function*

$$R_k(z) = S_t^-(x) + \Phi_k(x,y,t,T,0) + S_t^+(y), \qquad x,y \in \Sigma_k,$$

has a nondegenerate critical point z_k^0.

Indeed, R_k is the action of the concatenation of an asymptotic trajectory of the frozen system starting at O_t and ending at x, trajectory β_0 joining x and y in a neighborhood of γ_k, and a trajectory starting at y and asymptotic to O_t. The equation $\partial_T R_k = 0$ implies that $H_t = 0$ along $q(s)$. Then equations $\partial_x R_k = 0$ and $\partial_y R_k = 0$ imply that the concatenation is a smooth trajectory of the frozen system homoclinic to O_t. Thus it coincides with γ_t. Finally $\partial_t R_k = 0$ means that t is a critical point of $f(t)$. ∎

Next we define the DLS describing multibump trajectories. Let $J = \{\kappa = (\kappa_-,\kappa_+) \in K^2 : \kappa_- < \kappa_+\}$ be the set of vertices of the graph. We join $\kappa,\kappa' \in J$ with an edge if $\kappa_+ = \kappa'_-$. Define the discrete Lagrangian with $2m$ degrees of freedom by

$$L_\kappa(z_-,z_+,\varepsilon) = \Phi_k(z_-,\varepsilon) + S(t_- + \varepsilon T_-, t_+, y_-, x_+, \varepsilon), \qquad z_\pm = (x_\pm, y_\pm, t_\pm, T_\pm).$$

Thus $L_\kappa(z_-,z_+,\varepsilon)$ is the action of the broken trajectory which starts at $x_- \in \Sigma_{\kappa_-}$ at time t_-, travels near the homoclinic trajectory γ_{κ_-} till it reaches Σ_{κ_+} at the point y_- at time $t+\varepsilon T_-$, then travels close to the hyperbolic equilibrium O_t for $t_- + \varepsilon T_- \le t \le t_+$ and ends at $x_+ \in \Sigma_{\kappa_+}$ at time t_+.

By (6.17)–(6.18), critical points of the functional

$$A_{\mathbf{k}}(z) = \sum L_{\kappa_i}(z_i, z_{i+1}, \varepsilon), \qquad \kappa_i = (k_i, k_{i+1}),$$

where

$$z_i = (x_i, y_i, t_i, T_i), \qquad x_i, y_i \in \Sigma_{k_i}, \quad t_i \in I_{k_i}, \quad T_i > 0,$$

correspond to trajectories shadowing the chain of homoclinics (γ_{k_i}).

We make a gauge transformation replacing L_κ by the Lagrangian

$$\hat{L}_\kappa(z_-, z_+, \varepsilon) = L_\kappa(z_-, z_+, \varepsilon) + S_{\kappa^-}(x_-) - S_{\kappa^+}(x_+) = R_{\kappa^-}(z_-) + O(\varepsilon),$$

where R_{κ^-} has a nondegenerate critical point $z^0_{\kappa^-}$. Then $\hat{L}_\kappa$ has an anti-integrable form.

Note that the graph Γ describing the anti-integrable system is infinite. However, the Lagrangian is invariant with respect to $\mathbb{Z}$-action on $\mathbb{R}$, so uniform anti-integrability in Theorem 4.2 holds. Theorem 6.4 is proved.

7 Separatrix map

7.1 AI limit in Zaslavsky separatrix map

Consider an integrable area-preserving map F_0 having a hyperbolic fixed point with two homoclinic separatrix loops. Let F_ε be a perturbed map also assumed to be area-preserving. In an ε-neighborhood of the unperturbed separatrix loops the dynamics of F_ε is determined by the separatrix map.

The construction is presented in Fig 7. The left-hand side of the figure presents the phase space of the map F_ε. We see the hyperbolic fixed point p_ε and its asymptotic curves (separatrices), splitted for $\varepsilon \neq 0$. We also see two grey domains $\Delta^\pm_\varepsilon$ on which the separatrix map will be defined. Boundaries of these domains are curvilinear quadrangles. The "horizontal" sides can be regarded as lying on invariant KAM curves (this is convenient, but not necessary) while the "vertical" sides for each quadrangle are images of each other under the maps F_ε and F_ε^{-1}. For any point $z \in \Delta_\varepsilon = \Delta^+_\varepsilon \cup \Delta^-_\varepsilon$ its image $F_\varepsilon(z)$ lies outside Δ_ε. By definition the image of z under the separatrix map is $F^n_\varepsilon(z)$, where $n = n(\varepsilon)$ is the minimal natural number such that $F^n_\varepsilon(z) \in \Delta_\varepsilon$. In Figure 7 two such points z and their images are presented.

In some convenient coordinates the separatrix map can be computed in the form: an explicit part plus small error terms,

$$\begin{pmatrix} y \\ x \\ \sigma \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} y_+ \\ x_+ \\ \sigma_+ \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \begin{aligned} y_+ &= y + \lambda\, \partial V_\sigma / \partial x + O(\varepsilon), \\ x_+ &= x + \tfrac{1+O(\varepsilon)}{\lambda}(\omega_\sigma + \log|y_+|), \\ \sigma_+ &= \sigma \operatorname{sign} y_+, \qquad \sigma, \sigma_+ \in \{-1, 1\}. \end{aligned} \tag{7.1}$$

Here the variable x mod 1 changes along the separatrix, y changes across the separatrix, and the discrete variable $\sigma = \pm 1$ indicates near which loop the orbit is located at the given time moment. The functions $V_\sigma(x)$ (the Poincaré-Melnikov potentials) are periodic with period 1. Details can be found for example, in [62, 70]).



Figure 7: The separatrix map.

The map (7.1) has the form

$$y=\partial W/\partial x,\quad x_+=\partial W/\partial y_+,\quad \sigma_+=\sigma\operatorname{sign} y_+, \tag{7.2}$$

where the generating function

$$W=W(y_+,x,\sigma)=xy_+-\lambda V_\sigma(x)+\frac{1+O(\varepsilon)}{\lambda}\big(\omega_\sigma+\log|y_+|-1\big)y_+.$$

The first two equations (7.2) can be written as follows:

$$x_+dy_++ydx=dW(y_+,x,\sigma).$$

To present (7.1) in the Lagrangian form, consider another generating function (the Legendre transform of W)

$$\lambda L=x_+y_+-W,\qquad y_+dx_+-ydx=\lambda dL. \tag{7.3}$$

Here we use the fact that a Lagrangian is defined up to a nonzero constant multiplier. It is easy to obtain an explicit formula for L:

$$L(x,x_+,\sigma,\vartheta_+)=(1+O(\varepsilon))\vartheta_+e^{\lambda(x_+-x-\hat\omega_\sigma)}+V_\sigma(x), \tag{7.4}$$
$$\vartheta_+=\operatorname{sign} y_+,\quad \hat\omega_\sigma=\omega_\sigma+\lambda^{-1}\log\lambda^2.$$

Thus the separatrix map is a $\mathbb{Z}$-equivariant DLS, where $\mathbb{Z}$ acts on $M = \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{Z}_2\times\mathbb{Z}_2$ by the shifts

$$M \ni (x,\sigma,\vartheta) \mapsto k(x,\sigma,\vartheta) = (x+k,\sigma,\vartheta).$$

The Lagrangian form of the separatrix map is as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_- \\ x \\ \sigma_- \\ \vartheta \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} x \\ x_+ \\ \sigma \\ \vartheta_+ \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \begin{array}{l} \sigma = \sigma_-\vartheta, \\ \vartheta_+ = \sigma\sigma_+, \\ \dfrac{\partial}{\partial x}(L_- + L) = 0, \end{array} \tag{7.5}$$

where

$$L_- = L(x_-, x, \sigma_-, \vartheta), \quad L = L(x, x_+, \sigma, \vartheta_+).$$

The first two equations (7.5) are generated by the definition of ϑ ($\vartheta = \operatorname{sign} I$) and by the last equation (7.1). The third equation (7.5) follows from (7.3) since, according to (7.3) and to the analogous equation $ydx - y_-dx_- = dL_-$, we have

$$y = -\partial L/\partial x = \partial L_-/\partial x.$$

It is easy to check that the quantities x_+, σ and ϑ_+ are computed uniquely from (7.5) in terms of x_-, x, σ_-, and ϑ.

We obtain a DLS with extra discrete variables σ and ϑ. Any sequence

$$\mathbf{z} = \{z_j\}, \quad z_j = \begin{pmatrix} x_j \\ \sigma_j \\ \vartheta_j \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \sigma_{j+1} = \sigma_j\vartheta_{j+1}$$

is said to be a path. Let Σ be the set of all paths.

In general the index j takes all integer values. However, it is possible to consider also semifinite and finite paths. Paths finite from the left begin with a triple f_j, where $x_j = +\infty$. Paths finite from the right end with f_j, where $x_j = -\infty$. Paths finite from the left and from the right are called finite.

The action A is defined as the formal sum

$$A = A(f) = \sum_j L(x_j, x_{j+1}, \sigma_j, \vartheta_{j+1}).$$

The path f^0 is said to be an extremal (or a trajectory) iff $\partial A/\partial x_j|_{f=f^0} = 0$ for any j.

Note that semifinite trajectories belong to separatrices. Finite ones belong to both stable and unstable separatrices, and therefore they are homoclinic trajectories.

We define the distance ρ on Σ in the following way. Let $\mathbf{z}'$ and $\mathbf{z}''$ be paths, where

$$\mathbf{z}'_j = \begin{pmatrix} x'_j \\ \sigma'_j \\ \vartheta'_j \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{z}''_j = \begin{pmatrix} x''_j \\ \sigma''_j \\ \vartheta''_j \end{pmatrix}.$$

We put $\rho(\mathbf{z}', \mathbf{z}'') = \infty$ if the sequences σ'_j, ϑ'_j do not coincide with $\sigma''_j, \vartheta''_j$ or if for some j only one of the triples is defined. Otherwise we put

$$\rho(\mathbf{z}', \mathbf{z}'') = \sup_j |x'_j - x''_j|.$$

Here we put $|-\infty-(-\infty)| = |+\infty-(+\infty)| = 0$.

Let $\mathrm{Cr}(\sigma)$ denote a finite set of nondegenerate critical points of the function V_σ. The set Σ contains the subset Π of simple paths (codes). By the definition a path $\mathbf{z}$ is simple if $x_j \in \mathrm{Cr}(\sigma_j)$ for any j.

Theorem 7.1 *Suppose that the the constants c_1, $c_2 = c_2(c_1)$ are sufficiently large. Then, for any simple path $\mathbf{z}^*$ such that $x^*_j - x^*_{j+1} > c_1$ for all j, there exists a unique trajectory $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}$ in the c_2^{-1}-neighborhood of $\mathbf{z}^*$. The trajectory $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}$ is hyperbolic.*

Theorem 7.1 establishes a symbolic dynamics in a neighborhood of separatrices of an area-preserving map. Theorem 7.1 can be deduced from Theorem 4.1 by introducing the DLS with the Lagrangians

$$L_\kappa(x_-, x_+) = L(x_- + k, x_+, \sigma, \theta), \qquad \kappa = (k, \sigma, \theta), \quad x_\pm \in (0, 2\pi),$$

where $k > c_1$ is large enough. The corresponding graph has vertices κ, and vertices κ, κ' are joined by an edge if $\sigma' = \sigma\theta$. There is an edge γ for every nondegenerate critical point of V_σ in $(0, 2\pi)$. For large k, the DLS is anti-integrable. The graph Γ is infinite but condition **U** of uniform anti-integrability evidently holds.

The traditional approach to symbolic dynamics near separatrices is presented in [13, 2, 60]. Another version of the separatrix map is constructed by Shilnikov and Afraimovich, [1], see also [64]. This construction is also given in Section 6.1.

7.2 Separatrix map and Arnold diffusion

Ideas of AI limit can be applied in the problem of Arnold diffusion. Here we only discuss the *a priori* unstable case where unlike the original (*a priori stable* situation, [3]) the unperturbed integrable system contains normally hyperbolic manifold N. In the perturbed system chaos is essentially concentrated near N and its asymptotic manifolds.

We consider a nonautonomous near-integrable Hamiltonian system on the phase space $\mathbb{T}^n_x \times \overline{\mathscr{D}} \times D \times \mathbb{T}_t$, where $\mathscr{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^n_y$, is an open domain with compact closure $\overline{\mathscr{D}}$, $D \subset \mathbb{R}^2_{(v,u)}$ is an open domain. The Hamiltonian function and the symplectic structure are as follows:

$$H(y,x,v,u,t,\varepsilon) = H_0(y,v,u) + \varepsilon H_1(y,x,v,u,t) + \varepsilon^2 H_2(y,x,v,u,t,\varepsilon),$$
$$\omega = dy \wedge dx + dv \wedge du.$$

As usual $\varepsilon \geq 0$ is a small parameter. Hamiltonian equations have the form

$$\dot{y} = -\partial H/\partial x, \quad \dot{x} = \partial H/\partial y, \quad \dot{v} = -\partial H/\partial u, \quad \dot{u} = \partial H/\partial v. \tag{7.6}$$

We assume that in the unperturbed Hamiltonian the variables y are separated from u and v i.e., $H_0(y,v,u) = F(y, f(v,u))$. The function f has a nondegenerate saddle point $(v,u) = (0,0)$, a unique critical point on a compact connected component of the set

$$\gamma = \{(v,u) \in D : f(v,u) = f(0,0)\}.$$

In dynamical terminology $(0,0)$ is a hyperbolic equilibrium of the Hamiltonian system $(D, dv \wedge du, f)$ with one degree of freedom, and the corresponding separatrices γ are doubled. Topologically these separatrices form a figure-eight: two loops, $\gamma^{\pm}$, issuing from one point, $\gamma = \gamma^+ \cup \gamma^-$.

Hence the unperturbed normally hyperbolic manifold is

$$N = \mathbb{T}^n_x \times \overline{\mathscr{D}} \times (0,0) \times \mathbb{T}_t.$$

It is foliated in tori

$$N_y = \{x,y,u,v,t) : u = v = 0,\ y = \text{const}\}$$

carrying quasi-periodic dynamics with frequencies

$$\begin{pmatrix} \nu(y) \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \nu(y) = \frac{\partial H_0}{\partial y}(y,0,0).$$

We are interested in the perturbed dynamics near asymptotic manifolds of N.

The problem of Arnold diffusion in a priori unstable case has three aspects, contained in the following

Conjecture 7.1 *[5, 69].*

A *(genericity). Diffusion exists for an open dense set of C^r-perturbations, where $r \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty, \omega\}$ is sufficiently large.*

B *(freedom). Projection of a diffusion trajectory to the y-space can go in a small neighborhood of any smooth curve $\chi \subset \mathscr{D}$.*

C *(velocity). There are "fast" diffusion trajectories whose average velocity along χ is of order $\varepsilon/\log\varepsilon$.*

There are several different approaches to the problem. Traditional approach is based on the construction of transition chains of hyperbolic tori [3, 34, 35, 43, 44], later it was effectively supplemented with the idea of the scattering map [36, 37, 38] and symbolic dynamics in polysystems [26]. Variational approach was developed in [11, 9, 10, 32, 33, 46, 49, 50].

Conjecture 7.1 is proven only in the case $n = 1$ (2 and a half degrees of freedom), [68]. Here we explain briefly ideas and methods of [68]. The system $(7.6)|_{\varepsilon=0}$ has the n-parametric family of (partially) hyperbolic $(n+1)$-tori N_y which foliate the normally hyperbolic manifold N. Asymptotic manifolds of N form two components $\{y\} \times \mathbb{T}^n_x \times \gamma^{\pm} \times \mathbb{T}_t$. Hence, after perturbation the situation reminds the one discussed in the previous section. In the phase space of the time-one map a picture analogous to that presented in Figure 7 appears. However unlike the case considered in Section 7.1 now we have to deal with a family of hyperbolic tori and their asymptotic manifolds. The separatrix map still can be defined [66] and explicit formulas for it can regarded as a multidimensional generalization of (7.1).

The separatrix map can be presented in the form

$$
\begin{gathered}
(\zeta, \rho, \tau_-, \tau, \sigma_-, \theta) \mapsto (\zeta_+, \rho_+, \tau, \tau_+, \sigma, \theta_+), \\
\rho = \tfrac{\partial \mathscr{R}}{\partial \zeta}, \quad \zeta_+ = \tfrac{\partial \mathscr{R}}{\partial \rho_+}, \quad \tfrac{\partial}{\partial \tau}(\mathscr{R}_- + \mathscr{R}) = 0, \quad \sigma = \sigma_- \vartheta, \quad \vartheta_+ = \sigma\sigma_+, \\
\mathscr{R} = R(\zeta, \rho_+, \tau, \tau_+, \sigma, \theta_+, t_+, \varepsilon), \quad \mathscr{R}_- = R(\zeta_-, \rho, \tau_-, \tau, \sigma_-, \theta, t, \varepsilon).
\end{gathered} \tag{7.7}
$$

(compare with (7.5)). Here up to small error terms $\varepsilon\rho = y$, $\zeta - x$ is a function of y, u, v. The integer vatiable t has a meaning of time the trajectory of the time-one map travels outside analogs of the domains $\Delta^{\pm}_{\varepsilon}$, see Fig. 7. The variables σ and

ϑ are analogous to that from Section 7.1, and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{R} &= \langle \rho_+, \zeta + \nu t_+ \rangle - (\tau_+ - \tau - t_+)\mathbf{H}(\varepsilon\rho_+, \zeta) \\ &\qquad - \vartheta_+ e^{\lambda(\tau_+ - \tau - \omega_+^\sigma)} + \hat{\Theta}^\sigma(\varepsilon\rho_+, \zeta, \tau), \\ \omega_+^\sigma &= t_+ + \lambda^{-1}\log\varepsilon + f(\varepsilon\rho_+), \quad \nu = \nu(\varepsilon\rho_+), \quad \lambda = \lambda(\varepsilon\rho_+).\end{aligned}$$

If $n = 0$, we do not have variables ρ and ζ, and only the last two terms in $\mathscr{R}$ remain. In this case up to a constant multiplier $\mathscr{R}$ converts into L, see (7.4).

We are interested in the case when the quantities $t_+ + \lambda^{-1}\log\varepsilon$ are greater than a big positive constant K_0. So, e^{K_0} plays the role of a large parameter in the AI limit. The function $\mathbf{H}$ is essential only in small neighborhoods of strong (low order) resonances

$$\{\rho : \langle \nu(\rho), k\rangle + k_0 = 0\}, \qquad k \in \mathbb{Z}^n,\ k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad |k| + |k_0| < C.$$

We see that the dynamical system (7.7) is partially Hamiltonian (w.r.t. ρ, ζ) and partially Lagrangian (w.r.t. τ). We can represent dynamics of the separatrix map by a DLS as follows.

Because of the presence of new Hamiltonian variables we have to use a certain generalization of the method of AI limit. Unfortunately, in this generalization the symbolic dynamics is not as clean and standard as the one given in Sections 4.1 or 7.1. The construction is as follows, [67]. Having a finite piece of a trajectory of the separatrix map and the corresponding quasitrajectory, a piece of the same length (the code), we present a rule according to which the code can be extended by adding a new point. Then according to the main result of [67] the trajectory can be slightly deformed and extended staying close to the longer code. So we have again the pair: a piece of trajectory with a code. By using a certain freedom in the rule for the extension of a code, one can hope to push the trajectory in the desired direction in the y-space.

Here another difficulty appears. This possibility to push the orbit in the proper direction is relatively simple in the nonresonant zone i.e., where the frequency vector $(\nu(y), 1) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ (1 is the time frequency) does not allow resonances of low orders. In a near-resonant domain construction of a reasonable code is a separate delicate problem, solved completely only in the case of two-and-a-half degrees of freedom [68]. Diffusion in domains free of low order resonances in the case of an arbitrary dimension is established in [69].

Finally we mention another application of the separatrix map. According to [29, 48, 51] in (so far special cases of) *a priori* unstable systems with 2 and a

half degrees of freedom a large set of trajectories is constructed whose projections to the y-axis for small $\varepsilon > 0$ behave like trajectories of the Brownian motion. This shows that proposed by Chirikov term "diffusion" is quite adequate for the phenomenon discussed above.

References

[1] Afraimovich, V.S. Shilnikov, L.P. Small periodic perturbations of autonomous systems. (Russian) Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 214 (1974), 739–742.

[2] Alekseev V. M., Quasi-random dynamical systems I,II,III. *Mat. Sb.* 1968, V. 76, P. 72–134, 1968, V. 77, P. 545–601, 1969, V. 78, P. 3–50. (Russian) Engl. transl. in *Math. USSR-Sb.* 1968, V. 5, P. 73–128, 1968, V. 6, 1969, V. 7, P. 1–43.

[3] Arnold V.I., Instability of dynamical systems with several degrees of freedom. Sov. Math. Dokl. **5**, 581–585, 1964.

[4] Arnold V. I., Mathematical methods in classical mechanics. Springer-Verlag, New-York, Heidelberg, Berlin 1982.

[5] Arnold V. I., Kozlov V. V., Neishtadt A. I., Mathematical aspects of classical and celestial mechanics. Encyclopedia of Math. Sciences, Vol. 3, Springer-Verlag 1989.

[6] Aubry S., Abramovici G., Chaotic trajectories in the standard map: the concept of anti-integrability. *Physica* 43 D, 1990, 199–219.

[7] Aubry S., MacKay R. S. and Baesens C., Equivalence of uniform hyperbolicity for symplectic twist maps and phonon gap for Frenkel-Kontorova models Physica D **56**, 123-134 (1992).

[8] Baesens, C., Chen, Y.-Ch., and MacKay, R. S., Abrupt Bifurcations in Chaotic Scattering: View from the Anti-Integrable Limit, Nonlinearity, 2013, vol.26, no. 9, pp. 2703–2730.

[9] Berti M. and Bolle P. A functional analysis approach to Arnold Diffusion, Annales Institute Henri Poincareé, analyse non-lineaire, 19, 4, 2002, pp. 395-450.

[10] Berti M., Biasco L., and Bolle P., Drift in phase space: A new variational mechanism with optimal diffusion time. J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) 82 (2003), no. 6, 613–664.

[11] Bessi U., An approach to Arnold's diffusion through the calculus of variations. *Nonlin. Anal. TMA* **20**, 1303–1318 (1996)

[12] Bialy M., Maximizing orbits for higher-dimensional convex billiards. *J. of Modern Dynamics*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 2009, 51-59.

[13] Birkhoff G. D., Dynamical systems. Amer. Math. Soc. Colloquium Publications V. 9, New York, 1927.

[14] Bolotin S.V., Libration motions of natural dynamical systems. Vestnik Moskov. Univ. Ser. I Mat. Mekh. 1978, no. 6, 72–77.

[15] Bolotin S., Symbolic dynamics near minimal hyperbolic invariant tori of Lagrangian systems, Nonlinearity, 14:5 (2001), 1123–1140.

[16] Bolotin S., Shadowing chains of collision orbits, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst., 14:2 (2006), 235–260.

[17] S. Bolotin, Symbolic dynamics of almost collision orbits and skew products of symplectic maps. *Nonlinearity*, **19** (2006), 2041–2063.

[18] Bolotin S. V. and MacKay R., Multibump orbits near the anti-integrable limit for Lagrangian systems *Nonlinearity*, V.10, No 5, 1997, 1015.

[19] S. Bolotin and R.S. MacKay, Periodic and chaotic trajectories of the second species for the *n*-centre problem. *Celest. Mech. & Dynam. Astron.*, **77** (2000), 49–75.

[20] Bolotin S. V. and MacKay R.S., Nonplanar second species periodic and chaotic trajectories for the circular restricted three-body problem, Celestial Mech. Dynam. Astronom., 94:4 (2006), 433-449.

[21] Bolotin S., Negrini P., Global regularization for the n-center problem on a manifold, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst., 8:4 (2002), 873892.

[22] S. Bolotin, P. Negrini, Variational approach to second species periodic solutions of Poincaré of the three-body problem, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst., 33:3 (2013), 1009-1032.

[23] Bolotin S., Negrini P., Shilnikov lemma for a nondegenerate critical manifold of a Hamiltonian system, Regul. Chaotic Dyn., 18:6 (2013), 774–800.

[24] Bolotin S. and Rabinowitz P.H., A variational construction of chaotic trajectories for a reversible Hamiltonian system. *J. Differ. Equat.,* **48** (1998), 365–387.

[25] Bolotin S. and Treschev D., Remarks on the definition of hyperbolic tori of Hamiltonian systems, Regul. Chaotic Dyn., 5:4 (2000), 401-412

[26] Bounemoura A. and Pennamen E. Instability for a priori unstable Hamiltonian systems: a dynamical approach. (English summary) Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 32 (2012), no. 3, 753–793.

[27] Buffoni, B. and Sere, E., A Global Condition for Quasi-Random Behavior in a Class of Conservative Systems, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 1996, vol.49, no.3, pp. 285–305.

[28] Bunimovich L.A., Sinai Ya.G., Chernov N.I. Statistical properties of two-dimensional hyperbolic billiards. (Russian) Uspekhi Mat. Nauk 46 (1991), no. 4(280), 43–92, 192; translation in Russian Math. Surveys 46 (1991), no. 4, 47–106

[29] O. Castejon, V. Kaloshin, Random Iteration of Maps on a Cylinder and diffusive behavior Preprint. June 13, 2015. http://www.math.umd.edu/∼vkaloshi/papers/random-iteration.pdf

[30] Y.-C. Chen, Anti-integrability in scattering billiards, Dyn. Syst. 19 (2004) 145-159.

[31] Chen, Yi-Chiuan, On topological entropy of billiard tables with small inner scatterers. Adv. Math. 224 (2010), no. 2, 432–460.

[32] Cheng Ch.-Q. and Yan J., Existence of diffusion orbits in a priori unstable Hamiltonian systems. J. Differential Geom. 67 (2004), no. 3, 457–517.

[33] Cheng Ch.-Q. and Yan J., Arnold diffusion in Hamiltonian systems: a priori unstable case J. Differential Geom. Volume 82, Number 2 (2009), 229-277.

[34] Chierchia L. and Gallavotti G., Drift and diffusion in phase space. Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, **60** (1), 1994 1–144.

[35] Delshams A., de la Llave R. and Seara T., A geometric mechanism for diffusion in Hamiltonian systems overcoming the large gap problem: heuristics and rigorous verification on a model. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 179 (2006), no. 844, viii+141 pp.

[36] A. Delshams, R. de la Llave, T.M. Seara, Geometric properties of the scattering map of a normally hyperbolic invariant manifold, Adv. Math. 217 (3) (2008) 1096–1153.

[37] Delshams A. and Huguet G. Geography of resonances and Arnold diffusion in a priori unstable Hamiltonian systems. Nonlinearity 22 (2009), no. 8, 1997–2077.

[38] Delshams A. and Huguet G. A geometric mechanism of diffusion: rigorous verification in a priori unstable Hamiltonian systems. (English summary) J. Differential Equations 250 (2011), no. 5, 2601–2623.

[39] B. Deng, The Shilnikov problem, exponential expansion, strong λ-lemma, C^1-linearization and homoclinic bifurcation. *J. Differ. Equat.*, **79** (1989), 189–231.

[40] Devaney, R. L., Homoclinic Orbits in Hamiltonian Systems, J. Differential Equations, 1976, vol.21, no.2, pp. 431–438.

[41] Duarte P., Plenty of elliptic islands for the standard family of area preserving maps. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincare Anal. Non Lineaire* 11 (1994), no. 4, 359–409.

[42] R. W. Easton, J.D. Meiss, G. Roberts, Drift by Coupling to an Anti-Integrable Limit, Physica D 156, 201–218. (2001).

[43] Fontich E. and Martin P. Arnold diffusion in perturbations of analytic integrable Hamiltonian systems. Discrete Contin. Dynam. Systems 7 (2001), no. 1, 61–84.

[44] Gallavotti G., Gentile G., Mastropietro V. Hamilton-Jacobi equation and existence of heteroclinic chains in three time scales systems. Nonlinearity 13 (2000) 323-340

[45] V. Gelfreich and D. Turaev, Unbounded energy growth in Hamiltonian systems with a slowly varying parameter. *Comm. Math. Phys.*

[46] Gidea M. and Robinson C. Diffusion along transition chains of invariant tori and Aubry-Mather sets. Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 33 (2013), no. 5, 1401–1449.

[47] Gole C., Symplectic Twist Maps. Advanced Series in Nonlinear Dynamics vol 18, Singapore: World Scientific (2001) **283** (2008), 769–794.

[48] M. Guardia, V. Kaloshin, J. Zhang A second order expansion of the separatrix map for trigonometric perturbations of a priori unstable systems Preprint. September 30, 2015, http://arxiv.org/pdf/1503.08301v2.pdf

[49] Kaloshin V. and Levi M. Geometry of Arnold diffusion. SIAM Rev. 50 (2008), no. 4, 702–720.

[50] Kaloshin, V. and Zhang, K., Partial Averaging and Dynamics of the Dominant Hamiltonian, with Applications to Arnold Diffusion, arXiv:1410-1844 (2014).

[51] V. Kaloshin, J. Zhang, K. Zhang Normally Hyperbolic Invariant Laminations and diffusive behaviour for the generalized Arnold example away from resonances. Preprint, April 6, 2015 http://www.math.umd.edu/∼vkaloshi/papers/nhil-rand-model.pdf

[52] Katok A., Hasselblatt B. Introduction to the Modern Theory of Dynamical Systems. Cambridge University Press, 1997.

[53] Klein, M., Knauf, A., Classical Planar Scattering by Coulombic Potentials. Springer (1992)

[54] Knill, O., Topological entropy of standard type monotone twist maps. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 348 (1996), no. 8, 2999–3013.

[55] Kozlov V. and Treschev D., Billiards: a genetic introduction to the dynamics of sysetms with impacts. Translations of Mathematical Monographs, vol. 89, AMS, 1991.

[56] Lerman, L. M., Complex Dynamics and Bifurcations in a Hamiltonian System Having a Transversal Homoclinic Orbit to a Saddle Focus, Chaos, 1991, vol.1, no. 2, pp. 174–180.

[57] MacKay R. S., Meiss J. D., Cantori for symplectic maps near the anti-integrable limit. *Nonlinearity* **5**, V. 149, 1992, 1–12.

[58] Mather, J. N., Existence of quasi-periodic orbits for twist homeomorphisms of the annulus, *Topology*, **21**, (1982), 457–467.

[59] D. McDuff and D. Salamon, *Introduction to Symplectic Topology.* Oxford Mathematical Monographs. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1998.

[60] Nitecki Z. Differentiable Dynamics, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England, 1971.

[61] Piftankin G.N. 2006 Diffusion speed in the Mather problem *Nonlinearity* **19**, 2617-2644

[62] Piftankin G.N. and Treschev D.V. Separatrix map in Hamiltonian systems. (Russian) Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **62**, 2007, No. 2(374), 3–108; translation in Russian Math. Surveys **62**, 2007, No. 2, 219–322

[63] Shilnikov, L. P., On a Poincaré-Birkhoff Problem, Math. USSR-Sb., 1967, vol.3, no. 3, pp. 353–371.

[64] Shilnikov L.P., Shilnikov A. L., Turaev D.V. and Chua L.O. Methods of qualitative theory in nonlinear dynamics. Part II, 2001, Singapore: World Scientific.

[65] Smale S., Diffeomorphisms with many periodic points. Princeton University Press, 1965.

[66] Treschev D., Multidimensional separatrix maps J. Nonlin. Sci. **12**, No. 1, 2002, 27–58.

[67] Treschev D., Trajectories in a neighborhood of asymptotic surfaces of a priori unstable Hamiltonian systems. Nonlinearity **15**, 2002, 2033–2052.

[68] Treschev, D. Evolution of slow variables in a priori unstable Hamiltonian systems. Nonlinearity 17 (2004), no. 5, 1803–1841.

[69] Treschev D., Arnold diffusion far from strong resonances in multidimensional a priori unstable Hamiltonian systems. Nonlinearity **25** (2012) 2717–2757.

[70] Treschev D. and Zubelevich O. Introduction to the perturbation theory of Hamiltonian systems. Springer, 2009.

[71] Turaev, D. V., Hyperbolic Sets near Homoclinic Loops to a Saddle for Systems with a First Integral, Regul. Chaotic Dyn., 2014, 19 (6), pp. 681-693.

[72] Turaev, D. V. and Shilnikov, L. P., Hamiltonian Systems with Homoclinic Saddle Curves, Soviet Math. Dokl., 1989, vol.39, no.1, pp. 165–168.

[73] Vasilyeva, A.B., and V.F. Butuzov, Asymptotic expansion of the singularly perturbed equations solutions. Nauka, Moscow (1973).

[74] Veselov A.P., Integrable mappings. Russian Math. Surveys **46**, 1991, No. 5, 1–51.

[75] Walters P., An introduction to Ergodic Theory, p. 178, Springer Verlag: New-York, Heidelberg, Berlin, 1982.